



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

No. 12

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Rabbi Mara Nathan, Temple Beth-El, San Antonio, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Holy One of blessing, You are the source of all. Regardless of our faith traditions, we recognize a force in the universe calling each of us to fulfill our potential.

We challenge ourselves to compensate for our shortcomings and emphasize our talents and energies for the greater good. We dedicate ourselves, each in our own way, to a life of service and meaning. Committed to the ideals of our great Nation, we are ever working towards the promise of what is still yet to be.

Therefore, we pray that You bestow the blessings of foresight, compassion, and patience upon the women and men of our Congress. May they be united in working for the good of our Nation, and may they recognize the spark of holiness in every human being.

Bless our leaders with strong minds and open hearts, ever ready to serve with integrity, purpose, and honor.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING RABBI MARA NATHAN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize our congressional prayer leader today, Rabbi Mara Nathan, and thank her for being here.

Rabbi Nathan began her tenure at Temple Beth-El in San Antonio in July 2014, where she was the first woman to serve as senior rabbi of a major congregation in the State of Texas.

At Temple Beth-El, Rabbi Nathan spent her time contributing to her congregation through community building, worship innovation, and teaching Torah to learners of all ages.

Prior to being ordained in 2000 by the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in New York, she received a bachelor of arts degree in history as well as certificates in Jewish studies and women's studies from Northwestern University in 1993.

During her studies, she was a recipient of the Steinhardt Fellowship, a scholarship awarded to rabbinical students to further informal education with teens and college-age students, and received academic awards for Hebrew, history, and Talmudic studies.

Before coming to San Antonio, Rabbi Nathan served almost 20 years at Larchmont Temple in New York, from 1994 to 2014, playing an instrumental role in all aspects of congregational life, including spiritual worship, ritual, and teaching.

We are happy to have Rabbi Nathan; her husband, Larry; and their children, Isaac, Solomon, and Miriam, in the San Antonio community.

Thank you, Rabbi, for your words of inspiration.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The Chair will entertain up to five further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING CHIEF RUSSELL ACHORD

(Mr. ABRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and ultimate sacrifice of West Feliciana Deputy Fire Chief Russell Achord, who died Wednesday while responding to a car accident.

Chief Achord served for 24 years and earned Officer of the Year and Valor in the Line of Duty recognitions during that time. He has also helped the community by implementing programs to teach high school students emergency care and improving the fire district's standard of care.

It is because of the sacrifices of first responders like Chief Achord that we

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H557

enjoy the lives we are able to lead. Our first responders put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe, and for that we can never say “thank you” enough.

Louisiana and West Feliciana Parish are better because of Chief Achord, and I ask that you keep his family and his firehouse in your prayers as they grieve.

PRESSING ISSUES FACING THE NATION

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Madam Speaker, enough is enough. Congress has a huge list of urgent, overdue bipartisan priorities for the American people, and we can't keep kicking the can down the road.

The short-term funding bill congressional Republicans passed yesterday ignores the pressing issues facing our Nation: funding the Children's Health Insurance Program and Community Health Centers; delivering needed resources to fight the deadly opioid epidemic; protecting our DREAMers from deportation; and providing disaster relief for Americans ravaged by hurricanes, mudslides, and wildfires.

These issues aren't going away. We must work together to address them immediately. Yet House Republicans have passed a fourth short-term funding measure in 4 months.

This month-by-month approach is reckless and dangerous for the entire Nation. It hinders our military, medical research, and infrastructure investments. It hurts seniors who depend on Social Security and Medicare and veterans getting care at the VA.

We need to stop the gimmicks and the cycle of delay. This is no way to run the government.

Madam Speaker, let's stop putting off for tomorrow the things we need to do today. Let's get to work.

REQUESTING THE RELEASE OF DOCUMENTS

(Mr. ZELDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, yesterday I went to the Capitol basement, where I read a classified document that angered me. It was frustrating. It was disappointing. It was also greatly enlightening.

The American people deserve, they must, they want to know what is in this document. Release the memo. Release the memo and all of the related material sourced in the memo. Release the file.

There is no concern—there should not be—for compromising any good sources and methods by releasing the memo and releasing the file. What it would reveal is the Fed's reliance on bad sources and methods.

The American public deserves the truth. We should not hide the truth from them. They have waited too long. Do not pull the wool over their eyes. Show them the facts. They deserve nothing less.

HONORING PAUL BOOTH

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and mourn the loss of a precious friend and mentor, Paul Booth.

Paul was a lifelong happy warrior for justice and a renowned progressive champion. For decades, he was a top leader in his union, AFSCME, fighting every day for working women and men.

From his youth as a student leader until the very day he died, he fought for peace and equality and opportunity. Paul Booth made things happen. He was a strategist and, above all, an organizer. With his life partner, Heather Booth, Paul inspired and taught us to work smarter and be better.

Paul Booth will be sorely missed by all those he touched, including my husband, Bob, and me. We were cherished friends for decades.

Our hearts go out to Heather and his sons, Gene and Dan, and all those whose lives he inspired and that he touched. We are so sorry. We are heartbroken.

NORTHAMPTON TOWNSHIP NAMED ONE OF THE 25 SAFEST CITIES

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Northampton Township in my district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, for being named the safest community in Pennsylvania.

Northampton rose to the top of the list of 25 safest cities with over 39,000 residents with a score of 90.97, the top fifth percentile in the entire Nation. The rankings are run by SafeHome, a professional security organization dedicated to making communities safer.

This recognition would not have been possible without the dedicated work of the entire Northampton Township Police Department and the leadership of Police Chief Mike Clark. Every day, these men and women put their lives on the line to protect their family, their friends, and their neighbors.

Quoting Chief Clark, who said it best:

It is not just us; it is working hand in hand with our residents, our administration and our board of supervisors, our fire department, our rescue squads, our school district. It is everyone working together that makes this a great place to live.

Well said, Chief Clark. We are so proud of the emergency services, governmental officials, and residents of Northampton Township. A job well done.

ON DACA AND DREAMERS

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, as Republicans demonstrate their inability to fund the Federal Government, 700,000 young people are left with an uncertain future. These DREAMers exemplify what is best about America. They have served in our military. They have built businesses and contributed to our communities.

This administration has waged an all-out assault on these young people, placing them in jeopardy and sowing fear that they will be sent back to countries that they do not even know. And now Republicans in Congress are turning their back on these young people as well.

We could have passed a fix to this problem as part of a government funding bill. That would have been a bipartisan solution, and it would have been supported by the vast majority of the American people.

Eighty-seven percent of Americans say DREAMers should be allowed to stay in the United States, yet President Trump is holding these young people hostage for a useless and offensive border wall. This is unconscionable.

We have a moral obligation to act. Congress needs to stay here and have an open vote on a clean DREAM Act. That is our moral obligation.

THE FILIBUSTER NEEDS TO END

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, as you just heard from the previous speaker and you read often in the press about a potential government shutdown, let me just tell you how this works.

The House passes a bill, then the Senate considers a bill. In the Senate, you either vote on the bill with majority vote or the minority party may choose to filibuster that bill. If the minority party chooses to filibuster the bill, which requires 60 votes for cloture, that shuts down that bill from passing.

We have passed 12 appropriations bills out of this Chamber right here that are still sitting in the Senate waiting to be taken up. One, the Democrats need to drop the filibuster.

I wish the majority party over there would actually put the bills on the floor and make the country see the filibuster live for all to view. You might see that over the weekend. I hope the majority leader does that.

What would cause a lack of funding for the government is simply the minority party, which is the Democrats, in the Senate abusing the filibuster and causing the government not to be funded. That is what is causing it. That is a fact.

You may have different opinions on other issues, but the fact of the matter

is this is the way the process works. A filibuster means you can't even get a vote on the bill. That is being done by the Democratic Party in the Senate right now. They have done it all year. It is dysfunctional. It needs to stop.

RECOGNIZING McClymonds High School Football Team

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the remarkable accomplishment of the McClymonds High School football team located in my congressional district.

McClymonds High School capped off a 14-0 season on December 10, 2017, with its second consecutive 5AA championship, after defeating Visalia's Golden West 42-12.

By winning two State championships in consecutive years, McClymonds became the first team in the Oakland Athletic League to achieve this impressive feat.

Now, McClymonds High School is a historic public high school in the West Oakland community of my district, with a strong history of athletic excellence. NBA legend Bill Russell and Major League Baseball Hall of Famer Frank Robinson have graced the halls of McClymonds High School.

Coach Michael Peters has carried forth the same tradition of excellence since 1992 and has continuously worked to ensure that his athletes succeed on the field but, most importantly, succeed in the classroom.

These young athletes represent the spirit, the resilience, and the passion of Oakland. Please join me in congratulating their historic championship win.

□ 0915

CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DIVISION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the Department of Health and Human Services under this new administration for doing something that should have been done a long time ago.

The agency is now opening a Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within its Office for Civil Rights. This new office will be devoted solely to treating people fairly, regardless of race, religion, or creed.

It is part of a broader theme in America where people, lately, from all religions and walks of life have been persecuted for their views and for not conforming to the views of others. How is that in the name of tolerance?

For example, I recently led an amicus brief on behalf of 144 Representatives and Senators for a Supreme Court case involving pregnancy clinics in

California who, under California law, are being forced to violate their own faith and effectively advertise for abortions, against their own will.

This is wrong, and it is evidence of the religious persecution in America today, religion being one of the founding cornerstones that have formed this country by our Founders.

This new DHS office is a positive sign for people of all faiths who are being bullied into adhering to a leftist agenda and are essentially being told their beliefs don't matter because they disagree with a conservative viewpoint.

REACH ACROSS THE AISLE TO FIND LONG-TERM FUNDING SOLUTION

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, we are 111 days into the current budget year and yet no closer to a budget than we were 4 months ago. We face a long to-do list, including funding our military, funding the Children's Health Insurance Program and community health centers, protecting DREAMers, repealing the medical device tax, supporting disaster relief, and the list goes on.

We simply can't continue kicking the can down the road with irresponsible temporary fixes like the ones this House passed last night. They hamper rather than help our military and other government agencies by forcing them to function in uncertainty, unable to make key strategic decisions and investments. This is no way to run our government.

Three times in the past year I crossed the aisle to vote for these short-term extensions, but I have seen no willingness to work with Democrats, no evidence of progress, and no reason to believe we won't be in the exact same position 1 month from now after yet another CR.

Enough is enough. That is why last night I voted "no." It is not too late. I urge my Republican colleagues to reach across the aisle and work with Democrats to find a long-term funding solution that addresses our country's needs.

Madam Speaker, I am committed and ready to work with my colleagues as long as it takes to achieve that responsible resolution.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Resolution, impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

Resolved, that Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is unfit to be President, unfit to represent the American values of decency and morality, respectability and civility, honesty and propriety, reputability and integrity, is unfit to defend the ideals that have made America great, unfit to defend liberty and justice for all as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance, is unfit to defend the American ideal of all persons being created equal as extolled in the Declaration of Independence, is unfit to ensure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity as lauded in the preamble to the United States Constitution, is unfit to protect government of the people, by the people, for the people as elucidated in the Gettysburg Address, and is impeached for high misdemeanors, and that the following Article of Impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:

Article of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States, in the name of itself and of the people of the United States, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high misdemeanors committed as President constituting harm to American society to the manifest injury of the people of the United States:

Article I

In his capacity as President of the United States, unmindful of the high duties of his high office, of the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, and respect necessary for stability within the society of the United States, Donald John Trump has with his bigoted statements done more than simply insult individuals and groups of Americans, he has harmed the American society by attempting to convert his bigoted statements into United States policy and by associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry on one or more of the following occasions:

On January 27, 2017, Donald John Trump issued Executive Order 13769 providing for a partial shutdown of immigration from mainly Muslim countries to fulfill a bigoted campaign promise that read as follows: "DONALD J. TRUMP STATEMENT ON PREVENTING MUSLIM IMMIGRATION (New York, NY) December 7th, 2015—Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what's going on," thereby attempting to convert a bigoted campaign promise into United States policy, associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt upon Muslims, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of religion.

On July 26, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially

as follows: After consulting with my generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statement into United States policy, associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt on transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of gender.

On August 15, 2017, Donald John Trump made a widely published statement characterizing a group of anti-Semites, bigots, racists, White nationalists, and Ku Klux Klansmen who rallied in Charlottesville, Virginia, as “very fine people,” thereby associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry.

On October 7, 2017, hate groups returned to Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting, “You will not replace us!” after having chanted in their August Charlottesville rally that “Jews will not replace us!”. Since this event on October 7, the President has made widely published statements about many issues, including the National Football League, but has not made one widely published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

On January 11, 2018, Donald John Trump held a meeting with a bipartisan group of congressional leaders that focused primarily on legislation that would provide a statutory protected status for individuals brought to the United States without documentation. At this meeting, as has been widely published, Donald John Trump made references to people from s-h-i-t-h-o-l-e (or s-h-i-t-h-o-u-s-e) countries. He also questioned why we need more Haitians or people from African countries, proclaiming that we should take them out. Donald John Trump then suggested that Norwegians were better suited to be immigrants to this country, thereby casting contempt on citizens and noncitizens who were welcomed here by previous Presidents due to natural disaster and civil unrest, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statements into United States policy, associating the Presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of national origin.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace and disrepute, has

sown discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President, and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump by causing such harm to the society of the United States is unfit to be President and warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 0930

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 694, I call up the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

“§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

“(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive (as defined in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Born-Alive Infants Protection Act’)):

“(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

“(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

“(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

“(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician’s office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

“(b) PENALTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

“(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

“(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

“(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

“(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

“(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

“(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

“(C) punitive damages.

“(3) ATTORNEY’S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney’s fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

“(4) ATTORNEY’S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff’s suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney’s fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

“(1) ABORTION.—The term ‘abortion’ means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

“(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

“(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

“(i) after viability, to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

“(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

“(2) ATTEMPT.—The term ‘attempt’, with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item pertaining to section 1531 the following:

“1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors.”.

(c) CHAPTER HEADING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CHAPTER HEADING IN CHAPTER.—The chapter heading for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “**Partial-Birth Abortions**” and inserting “**Abortions**”.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I.—The item relating to chapter 74 in the table of chapters at the beginning of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “**Partial-Birth Abortions**” and inserting “**Abortions**”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4712.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, the pro-life movement in Washington today is so exciting. Forty-five years ago this month, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Roe v. Wade* to make abortion legal and available nationwide.

While many abortion activists celebrate this anniversary, it represents a particularly somber occasion for those of us who advocate for life at all stages. Every year since this ruling, the pro-life community has gathered in Washington to march in peaceful protest, and that is exactly what brought thousands of passionate individuals here today.

I would like to extend a very sincere thank-you to each and every person who made this trip today to participate in the March for Life. For those individuals, their dedication to the pro-life movement is inspiring, and I and many of my colleagues stand with them.

I would especially like to recognize all of the individuals from my home State of Alabama who made the 12- to 13-hour trip. I am proud to have people like these Alabamians and others here to represent our great State and our Nation in this pro-life movement.

I believe it is only fitting that we take action today here in the House of Representatives to defend the defenseless as thousands of Americans are

here to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. I am proud to stand here today as a cosponsor of the legislation that we are considering, H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

I would also like to thank my colleague from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, for her leadership on this legislation.

At this point, I don't think that it is a secret that I am unapologetically pro-life, and I believe that our laws and our policies should assign the utmost importance to every life at every stage. I have been proud to stand here on the House floor many times in defense of the unborn, but this time we aren't even talking about unborn children. We are here to talk about those who have already been born.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is pretty simple. It states that, if a baby is born alive after a failed abortion, he or she must be given the same exact medical care that would be given to any other baby.

I know we will continue to play politics about when life begins and argue about the point at which the law should step in to protect it. And while I understand that not everyone agrees with my strong pro-life stance, I cannot fathom how any person could be opposed to legislation that protects babies who are so alive that you can look them in the eye.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712, the so-called Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Despite what its supporters would have us believe, this legislation would do nothing to enhance protections or enhance the quality of care if an infant is born after an attempted abortion. What it would do, however, is directly interfere with the doctor's medical judgment and dictate a medical standard of care that may not be appropriate in all circumstances, which could, in fact, put infants' lives at greater risk.

Let me say at the outset of this debate very clearly, it has always been the law that healthcare providers cannot deliberately harm newborn infants and that they must exercise reasonable care in their treatment of such infants. The bill's implications that providers who provide abortions routinely act in a callous or criminal manner that would result in an infant's death or that a provider who performs an abortion somehow cannot be trusted to take adequate measures to save a living baby's life is insulting and untrue.

In opposing this bill, I do not oppose in any way proper medical treatment for newborn infants, whatever the circumstances of their birth, but determining the proper treatment is for medical professionals to decide, not politicians in Congress.

When I supported the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act in 2002, my reasoning and the reasoning of my pro-choice colleagues was simple: Killing an infant who is born alive either by an act of omission or commission is infanticide. It was, is, and always should be against the law, and we saw no harm in reaffirming that fact.

That law passed Congress with bipartisan support precisely because it was harmless, even if it was also useless, since it did not change the preexisting law in any way. The bill specifically just reiterated existing law in florid language and did nothing to interfere with a doctor's medical judgment or to cause needless harm.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today puts children's lives and health at risk. It requires doctors to immediately ensure transportation and admission of the infant to a hospital in all cases, with no regard as to whether doing so is in the best interest of the child's health and well-being.

This mandate effectively overrides the case-by-case exercise of professional medical judgment by healthcare providers and replaces it with a blanket rule enforceable with criminal penalties. Such a ham-fisted approach fails to consider the fact that, in many cases, it may be safer and more conducive for the infant's health to care for the infant where it was born rather than transporting it many miles away. But this bill assumes that Congress knows better, and it imposes a new obligation on providers that, rather than saving lives, could put infants at risk.

I am sure that such a result is not what the bill's supporters intend, but all too often, this is what happens when Members of Congress try to dictate a physician's exercise of professional medical judgment.

Perhaps if this bill had gone through regular order, we could have avoided this unfortunate situation, but there has never been a committee markup or a hearing on this bill. I would have welcomed the opportunity to hear from expert witnesses on best practices and standards of care for infants. Members could have offered amendments and perfected the bill to ensure that it achieves our common goal of providing the best, most medically appropriate care to infants and their mothers.

I am disappointed but not surprised that my colleagues rushed this bill to the floor when there is no evidence at all that doctors currently are failing to provide an appropriate level of care and a chorus of provider groups oppose the bill.

This is clearly an effort to have this vote coincide with the presence of many anti-choice demonstrators in Washington. Sadly, rather than protecting infants, my Republican colleagues are putting them at greater risk in the service of politics.

I cannot support H.R. 4712 because it mandates a particular course of treatment: immediate transport to a hospital, which may not be appropriate in

every case and may be medically dangerous in certain cases. It abandons the practice of considering the best medical interest of infants and their mothers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this ill-conceived legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I have written remarks here, but after what I just heard, I have got to change what I was going to share.

The idea that you could oppose this bill under the ruse that it helps children and mothers is absolutely preposterous. The reason that we need this bill is because, yes, we did pass legislation in 2002 saying that a baby, if they are born during an abortion procedure, deserves life, but the problem is it is not being followed.

You can go out in the hall and visit with some nurses who have come here who have experienced the traumatic trauma of witnessing a baby born and then being put in a plastic bag and suffocated to death.

You can visit with the nurses that I have met who found a baby in a soiled closet who was born alive and was put there to die.

You can visit with a young mother named Angelee who unexpectedly gave birth to a baby boy in the restroom of an abortion clinic, and once she saw that baby, Angelee changed her mind. She wanted it to live. It was there. And her friend called the paramedics, but the clinic staff turned the medical team away, denying lifesaving care for Angelee's baby. The little baby died in the mother's arms as she rocked it and comforted it, showering it with love.

The reason this bill is needed is because it puts penalties on those healthcare officials who refuse to provide medical care, refuse to follow the law that you state you support. And so if you truly support life, if you support these babies, if you support the mother, then put some teeth in this legislation and make sure it is followed.

Madam Speaker, I urge everyone here to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, this bill is yet another inflammatory and unnecessary attack on women's rights, namely, a woman's constitutionally protected right to an abortion.

Of course we support proper care for infants who are born. Those of us who are mothers know that we want what is best for our children, but that is not what this bill is about.

This so-called Born-Alive bill seeks to further politicize abortion and criminalize providers. It is clearly unnecessary because doctors are already bound by guidelines that require them to provide emergency care when facing life-threatening circumstances.

Abortion care providers, including Planned Parenthood, are highly skilled and highly professional. They do not deserve to be criminalized. This is pure political theater.

Instead of ensuring that women have access to reproductive healthcare, the Republican majority is attempting to interfere with patients' relationships with their doctors, a provider's ability to practice medicine, and our constitutionally protected right to make choices about our own bodies.

And let us be clear: the impact of this will fall disproportionately on low-income and rural women and women of color.

And let's also be clear about this: Roe v. Wade gave women the right to access an abortion, and 7 in 10 Americans support that right across rural and urban America.

□ 0945

The vast majority on both sides of the aisle see through these cynical attempts to strip women's access to healthcare from the 20-week and 6-week abortion bans to these attempts to cut funding to Planned Parenthood. Our focus, Madam Speaker, should be on ensuring that every person in America has access to comprehensive healthcare, rather than harmful bills that strip healthcare or the Republican obsession with undermining the Affordable Care Act, which the American people have already said a loud "no" to.

We have so much real work to do: passing a real budget, passing a clean Dream Act, and fighting climate change.

Madam Speaker, I reject this bill. Let's do that real work instead.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, a member of the Judiciary Committee, for her outstanding work on this issue.

Today, thousands of people are rallying in the Nation's Capital to be part of the March for Life and to join a celebration of hope and compassion for those who do not yet have a voice and to save the lives of the unborn.

Many millions more have viewed videos of representatives of Planned Parenthood, which performs some 40 percent of all abortions each year. Those videos, recorded undercover, sadly portray a much darker side of our society. They show discussions of the exchange of money for the body parts of aborted babies. They also include discussions of instances during which in course of an attempted abortion, a baby is born intact and then shipped to a lab for the use of its body parts.

Congress must move immediately to protect any children born alive during the course of a failed abortion.

The bill before us today provides that in the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born

alive, any healthcare practitioner present must exercise the same degree of professional care to preserve the life of the child as he or she would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age.

The bill also provides that the child must be immediately—immediately—transported and admitted to a hospital. If a baby alive is left to die, the penalty can be up to 5 years in jail. If the child is cut open for its body parts or if some other overt act is taken, the punishment is that for first-degree murder, which must include life in prison or the death penalty.

Babies are born alive during failed abortions. The House Judiciary Committee heard direct testimony by two grown women who, as babies, survived attempted abortions. Gianna Jessen's mother was advised by Planned Parenthood to have an abortion. But as Ms. Jessen testified: "Instead of dying, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles." Her medical records state clearly that she was born alive during an abortion.

She continued to say: "Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. I was later diagnosed with cerebral palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And cerebral palsy is a great gift to me."

Just think of that for a moment. Ms. Jessen says cerebral palsy is a gift to her because it came with the gift of life. She forgave her mother long ago and gives praise each day for that gift of life, which she enjoys to its fullest to this day.

Ms. Jessen presented a picture at the hearing showing the results of the sort of abortion she survived.

I urge my colleagues to support the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act so others who survive failed abortions can have the same chance to be as thankful as Ms. Jessen and to support all efforts to save the unborn as well.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for his leadership on this issue.

Over 26 years ago I graduated from medical school and took an oath—an oath that hundreds of thousands of doctors have taken over the years—to do good, to do no harm, and to help our patients make the best healthcare decisions that affect their own circumstances.

But this bill, Mr. Speaker, would criminalize the practice of medicine and questions doctors' judgments. This bill attempts to intimidate doctors from providing safe, evidence-based healthcare. It would set the precedent that those without medical training can make choices for patients and dictate medical practices.

Why are we having politicians fill in for doctors?

Get the politicians out of the delivery room and let doctors care for their patients.

There is no disagreement that every baby born should receive all the medical care and treatment to survive. We are all in agreement. That is not what this bill is about. This bill is an attempt to undermine a woman's access to safe and legal reproductive health services. It is a blatant attempt to intimidate doctors from practicing the medicine that is in the best interest of their patients.

That is why I, along with my colleague and fellow physician, Dr. RUIZ, attempted to offer an amendment that upholds existing law that healthcare providers must exercise the same skill, care, and diligence as they would any other child born at the same gestational age.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MITCHELL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERA. It would have stopped Members of Congress, most of whom have no medical training, from interfering with how doctors practice medicine, because these decisions should be between a doctor and their patients.

I have always said that a woman's healthcare decision should be between her and her doctor, and that being a woman is not a preexisting condition.

As one of the few doctors who serves in this Chamber, listen to your doctor. I urge my colleagues to vote "no." That is what this doctor orders. Listen to him.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mrs. ROBY, for being a leader in this area.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This is commonsense legislation to strengthen, under penalty of law, the protection of infants who enter the world alive after attempted abortions.

We agree, as my colleagues on the other side have pointed out, that an infant born alive rightly has protection under the law and is, in fact, a person. This was established by the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, signed into law by President Bush in 2002 after it was passed by voice vote in this Chamber and by unanimous consent in the Senate.

We need this bill because, in practice, babies fighting for their lives after an attempted abortion are being denied treatment at the hands of so-called physicians.

This law affirms and protects the survivors of abortions and ensures that, just like every other baby who is born, these persons become hospital patients and receive the same medical

care as any other child born in the United States, not left in the very hands of those who sought to terminate their life.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unfortunately necessary bill to ensure healthcare professionals comply with the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote to protect our Nation's most vulnerable children and to affirm life by voting to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking Democrat on the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this moment in time in this previously respected and hallowed Hall is being diminished in the same manner in which the White House has recently been diminished. President Trump recently had a meeting and he referred to the Roosevelt Room, where he had a meeting with Cabinet members and other Senators, as "the studio." The studio, as if this is all theater, "Theatre of the Absurd."

Now, the President has a history in entertainment, and he may be trying to get a lifetime Oscar for the most farcical display or appearance of an executive since Governor LePetomane of Mel Brooks fame.

But this House should not follow in those footsteps and make this Congress a studio for a show being presented for the right-to-life people who are marching on this anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

This bill violates regular order, which we were supposed to be implementing. There was no hearing in the subcommittee, there was no hearing in the committee, and there have been no amendments allowed. This is irregular. This is not regular order.

This is a theater, a show put on and produced by Trent Franks, who left this House under disgrace, and continued by this Republican administration while this government possibly could go into shutdown. Yet we are acting like this is not the situation. We have a bill that will go nowhere in the Senate, that is unnecessary, and that violates the principles of federalism because most of the principles herein are reserved to the States and are unnecessary and are an impediment to a woman's health, in many cases making the Members of Congress doctors and superimposing their magical medical knowledge over that of physicians who are attending the pregnant woman and the child.

It is already against the law to murder a child. If the child is born, it is a child, and to not use the duty of care that a doctor has would be murder. That is State law, but it is already the law. To require it to be taken immediately to a hospital could endanger the child. It should be a decision by the doctor.

This is the theater of the absurd. We should not be in this House making it into a studio like President Trump has made the White House into a studio.

We should be going through regular order and considering bills that have a chance to protect the American people and women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act requires doctors and nurses present during an abortion to properly care for a child who survives it. It is an oath that we take to save lives.

Imagine that, Mr. Speaker. A doctor must give the same care to a baby born alive after a botched abortion that they would give to a baby born any other way at the same gestational age.

We are talking about saving living, breathing human beings, human beings that were formed in the image of their Creator with inherent dignity.

I am appalled when my friends from the other side of the aisle say it would endanger a child to take them to a hospital and to actually call for emergency care where all of the services are provided in an ambulance and take them to a hospital where they would have the best chance to survive.

As a grandmother and a nurse, it is utterly appalling that we have to pass legislation to save babies that are left to die.

Whether or not we agree that life begins at conception—and I truly hope that one day we will—this bill is merciful, it is humane, and it is just.

Abortion is brutal for both the mother and the child, and providing care for babies who have survived this horrific practice should never be a question. No one should be against this. We all should gather together and say that if a healthcare professional does not help to save the life of that baby that is born of a botched abortion, they should be held criminally liable just as they would for any other life that they refuse to save.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his leadership in serving on this committee, and I thank Mr. COHEN for his very eloquent explanation.

Let me say that I stand with these women, Jenny R., Kathy L., Lindsey, and Taias, women who have experienced the tragedy of losing a child, wanting a child, and wanting the protection of Roe v. Wade. I stand with these women.

I rise today to again ask the question: Why do we divide over the wonderment of birth?

□ 1000

I am reminded of H.R. 2175, passed in 2002, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which was widely supported.

Now, we come on the eve of a failed administration in its first year to stand as if we are doing something for those who are coming here—and I have great respect for their position of pro-life—but it doesn't mean that we must undermine the Constitution, add mandatory minimums, make up needs where there are no needs. That is what this particular bill does.

This amendment to H.R. 4712 is clearly involving and intruding into a process between the mother, the doctor, the family, and her God. There is no evidence of lawbreaking that has been uncovered that necessitates congressional involvement.

Abortion is a proven safe, legal, and humane practice. It has to be that way under the law. But we are in the middle of violating the Constitution and the Supreme Court cases by passing this legislation: up to 5 years in prison, a threat of financially crippling lawsuits, and, of course, shutting down those health facilities that we absolutely need.

Let me be very clear: we should be dealing with this shutdown that the Republicans are planning and moving forward. The reason we should be dealing with the shutdown is because law enforcement officers have no money, our clinics have no money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WAGNER). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, passing by the Capitol Police, it made me think of my own law enforcement officers in Houston, Texas. Because we do not have a budget, we do not have appropriations, we are about to shut down the government. We have a CR. There is no funding for police officers. There is no funding for the desperate people who have been impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Maria, and Irma. No funding whatsoever.

I salute the Senate and the Senate Democrats for standing firm for those people. There are no moneys for federally qualified health clinics. There are no moneys for children's health insurance.

You are not doing your job, and here we are trying to create mandatory minimums on a bill that is not necessary. I believe we should try to keep this government open with the right kind of law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712, the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act."

First of all, the majority's failure to govern and address the priorities of the American people is staggering as we are faced with a fourth continuing resolution finding ourselves four months into the fiscal year.

The majority has yet to come up with a long term spending bill rather than an incomplete stop gap that only covers the government until February 16.

Republicans have wasted time creating the GOP Tax Scam and now Republicans are still

wasting time debating this anti-women bill once again while there is no DACA solution and hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have grown up in this country and greatly contribute to society are facing unfair deportation.

I strongly oppose this latest attempt by the Republican House majority to limit women's rights to safe and legal abortions.

H.R. 4712 amends the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act—a 2002 law that the pro-choice community did not oppose.

This bill, however, adds penalties to the law and an entirely new section in which Congress attempts to intrude directly into medical practice of abortion care for anti-choice ideological purposes.

Anti-choice lawmakers say this new bill is necessary because some babies "survive" abortion procedures.

They cite the now-discredited videos attacking Planned Parenthood as their evidence.

Of course, such allegations are untrue: newborns already have many legal protections, and there is no similarity between safe, legal abortion care and infanticide.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. No evidence of lawbreaking has been uncovered that necessitates congressional involvement.

Abortion practice is safe, legal, and humane; any evidence of wrongdoing can and should be handled under existing law.

If there is ever a case of harm or mistreatment of newborns, then of course, it should be investigated and prosecuted.

No such case exists here.

That makes it even clearer that H.R. 4712 must have other purposes; we believe the bill's true goals are to inflame the public with outrageous accusations, to interfere with medical care, and to intimidate doctors out of practice.

This legislation is consistent with the assaults that the Trump Administration and anti-abortion members of Congress in both the House and Senate have been undertaking throughout the 115th Congress and show no signs of ending.

The bill intrudes into medical practice, its mandate is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to five years in prison and the threat of financially crippling lawsuits—that one can only conclude that H.R. 4712 hopes to intimidate abortion providers out of practice.

This interference in medical care could also cause tremendous additional grief to some families making difficult decisions in heart-breaking cases.

We would not tolerate similar intrusion by politicians into any other medical specialty; abortion care is no different.

Finally, it is important to put this legislation into the proper context.

We are in the midst of an unprecedented assault against reproductive rights: this bill is just one in a litany to restrict a woman's right to choose while using women as political pawns with an extremist, anti-choice base.

Instead of spending time attempting to roll back women's constitutionally protected rights, this House should be advancing legislation that will reform our truly broken immigration and criminal justice systems.

The bill before us is offered for a simple purpose; to sensationalize opposition to abortion and serve as a political decoy to shut down our government.

The United States Supreme Court ruled over 40 years ago, in *Roe v. Wade* (410 U.S.

113 (1973)), that a woman's constitutional right to privacy includes her right to abortion.

Since this landmark decision, abortion rates and risks have substantially declined, as have the number of teen and unwanted pregnancies.

Restricting all access to reproductive and women's health services only exacerbates a woman's risk of an unintended pregnancy and fails to accomplish any meaningful overthrow of *Roe v. Wade*.

In recent years, state policymakers have passed hundreds of restrictions on abortion care under the guise of protecting women's health and safety.

Fights here in Congress have been no different.

In my state of Texas a law that would have cut off access to 75 percent of reproductive healthcare clinics in the state was challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2014 and 2015.

On October 2, 2014, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a Texas law that required that all reproductive healthcare clinics that provided the full range of services would be required to have a hospital-style surgery center building and staffing requirements.

This requirement meant that only 7 clinics would be allowed to continue to provide a full spectrum of reproductive healthcare to women.

Texas has 268,580 square miles only second in size to the state of California.

The impact of the law in implementation would have ended access to reproductive services for millions of women in my state.

In 2015, the State of Texas once again threatened women's access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive health care, often couched in those same terms.

But we know that's not really the case.

If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicable issue of legality, lies with provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses

(e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

Planned Parenthood repeatedly maintains and supports that their affiliates involved with fetal tissue research comply with this requirement.

In fact, of the 700+ affiliate health care centers across the country, only 4 Planned Parenthood affiliates currently offer tissue donation service and of those 4, only 2 (California and Washington) offer fetal tissue donation services—that's 1 percent of all Planned Parenthood service centers.

The California affiliate receives a modest reimbursement of \$60 per tissue specimen and the Washington affiliate receives no reimbursement.

It is worth noting that fetal tissue has been used for decades.

Since the 1920's researchers have used fetal tissue to study and treat various neurological disorders, spinal cord injuries, diabetes, immune deficiencies, cancers and life-threatening blood diseases.

One of the earliest advances with fetal tissue was to use fetal kidney cells to create the first poliovirus vaccines, which are now estimated to save 550,000 lives worldwide every year.

The most widely known application in the field of human fetal tissue transplantation has been the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Many of our other common vaccines, such as polio, measles, chicken pox, rubella and shingles, have been developed through the use of fetal tissue or cell lines derived from fetal tissue.

When looking at the 1 percent of health care providers involved in fetal tissue donation and research, and no clear credible proof of illegal activity, it is obvious that attacks on Planned Parenthood are wholly misguided.

Planned Parenthood has one of the most rigorous Medical standards and accreditation processes in the country.

It is the only national provider that has developed a single set of evidence-based Medical Standards and Guidelines that define how health care is provided throughout the country.

Guidelines are developed and updated annually by a group of nationally-renowned experts, physicians, and scientists, including medical experts from Harvard and Columbia.

Planned Parenthood affiliates must submit to accreditation reviews that include 100 indicators (or high level areas of review) and over 600 individual Elements of Performance (or measures for review). Half of these relate to the provision of medical care and patient safety.

Violations of mandatory reporting regulations are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

It is no secret that the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country.

To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that provides healthcare services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood.

Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history doctoring and manipu-

lating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman's right to choose, but on women's health care across the board.

Hundreds of thousands have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them reduce their risk of unintended pregnancies and STD's, and improve their overall health through preventative screenings, education and planning, rather than restricting their access to lawfully entitled family-planning and private health services.

I urge all Members to vote against this bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has served a long time as the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in 2018, doctors routinely diagnose and treat illnesses and disabilities suffered by the littlest patients: unborn babies as well as newborns. They enhance both the child's health and longevity.

Abortionists, on the other hand, take a far different approach. They dismember and chemically poison children to death for profit.

For decades, babies have survived later term abortions. A Philadelphia Inquirer story some thirty-seven years ago called baby survival "the dreaded complication." In other words, it is a complication that a child survives.

I got involved in the pro-life movement when I read an AP story of a child who survived a later term abortion. The abortion rights movement then, in 1972, before Roe v. Wade—it was in New York—were apoplectic about it because the baby survived. That should have been a reason for rejoicing.

Dr. Willard Cates of the CDC was breathtakingly candid when he said: "Live births are little known because organized medicine, from fear of public clamor and legal action, treats them more as an embarrassment to be hushed up rather than a problem to be solved. It's like turning yourself in to the IRS, he said. What is there to gain? The tendency is not to report because there are only negative incentives."

An undercover investigator asked an abortionist: What do you do? What is your protocol when the child is born alive?

He said: "I mean the key is, you need to pay attention to who's in the room, right?"

That was what he was quoted as saying.

We are talking about coverup, ensuring that the people who are in the abortion clinic all gag themselves and not speak to the truth of what has happened when a baby has been killed after birth.

The legislation today requires a significant penalty for healthcare practitioners present at the time the child survives the abortion, exercise the same degree of skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child, and then get them to a hospital.

This is humane legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Of course, if a baby is born alive, everything must be done to protect that life. No one disagrees with that. Perhaps more importantly, it is already the law. To suggest otherwise is just wrong.

So don't be fooled. This bill is yet another effort to erode women's rights to obtain safe, legal abortions and a cynical attempt to appease those who have come to D.C. to advocate for the reversal of Roe v. Wade.

H.R. 4712 would insert the opinions of politicians into medical practice and the individual rights of women to make their own decisions. This is not what women want, what doctors were trained to do, and I personally find offensive the fact that there is a suggestion that Democrats are not for saving the lives of born children. Of course, we are. We all are.

This is not a necessary piece of legislation. It is already on the books.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to point out that it is not currently Federal law, or the law in all 50 States, that a baby born alive after a failed abortion receive medical treatment instead of being left on the floor to die. That is why we are here today, to require under Federal law nationwide that a baby born alive after a failed abortion receives medical care and isn't left on the floor or in a trash can to die.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, while many of us in this body disagree on the issue of abortion, we should all be able to agree that, once a child is born, he or she deserves protection.

If a doctor attempts to perform an abortion, sometimes a baby actually escapes and emerges from the womb still living. If this real-life scenario isn't terrible enough, sometimes these babies, who are breathing the same air as you and I, are left to die and their lives are terminated right there in the medical facility.

Madam Speaker, these surviving children from this terrible procedure need our protection.

Back in 2002, President Bush signed a bill that said if an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, that infant

is a legal person for all purposes under our laws. However, this law didn't create additional protections for these surviving children.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to support Mrs. BLACKBURN's bill that would add additional protections. Whether it is making sure an infant is immediately taken to a hospital or mandating these doctors do everything they can to save their life, these survivors need our protection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from North Carolina an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, last year, we voted on a bill to ban abortions after 20 weeks. While I supported that bill, many of my colleagues chose not to, but I urge them to at least support this commonsense bill to protect the lives of abortion survivors.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose this legislation. Of course, infants born alive deserve healthcare. As Dr. BERA just explained, doctors are already obligated to provide that. But this bill threatens to send healthcare providers to jail and women to back alleys.

Instead of debating this bill, we should be working to reduce the rate of unintended pregnancies which, of course, reduces the number of abortions. History shows that when abortions are restricted or banned, they do not go away. They become dangerous and unsafe. Look at countries that restrict abortion. Every year, thousands of women die from unsafe procedures.

Yet here we are debating a bill that will make criminals out of doctors and will drive more women to hazardous self-help methods.

There are effective ways to reduce unintended pregnancies and improve maternal health, which is what we should be doing. Instead, this bill disregards the professional judgment of trained medical professionals. It imposes extreme new standards of care. That is why providers like the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists strongly oppose this legislation.

Madam Speaker, women in this country will continue rejecting archaic and counterproductive policies like this, just as my colleagues should reject this bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM).

Mrs. NOEM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

The whole experience of being a first-time parent can be really overwhelming. I remember feeling this incredible sense of joy. But there are always so many questions, too. How are

we going to provide for this baby? What kind of person will they become? What if something goes wrong?

There is no doubt a lot of things can go wrong in a pregnancy, but we find comfort in the fact that there is a whole team of healthcare professionals there who will do everything that they can to care for that baby or to save that baby, if necessary.

But what if they didn't?

What if they stepped back and refused to deliver care to your child?

It would be unacceptable.

Yet when a baby is born alive after a failed abortion, that same healthcare professional may not deliver the life-saving care that that baby deserves.

Melissa Ohden from Sioux City, Iowa, was born alive after an abortion attempt. By God's grace and the work of an incredible nurse, Melissa survived. As she tells it, there were demands made to leave her there to die in the hospital room that day. She says that ultimately a nurse rushed her off to the NICU because, in the nurse's words, "Melissa just kept gasping for breath." That nurse wasn't going to leave her there to die.

Madam Speaker, every life has dignity and every life deserves respect. We ultimately need to ban abortion and protect life from the moment of conception. But until that is done, we must fight to protect every single precious little life that we can. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act will do that and help us be successful in that mission.

With that, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712.

This bill would allow the Federal Government to override a doctor's medical judgment, without exception. It is motivated by politics, not science.

First, this bill reiterates current law, which already protects all newborns from medical negligence. Second, the criminal penalties in this bill go above and beyond current law and are clearly intended to intimidate doctors. This isn't sound medical practice. This is politics impeding a doctor's medical judgment.

And what is more, this intimidation would endanger newborns. This bill would require all newborn infants to be immediately transferred to the nearest hospital, but not all hospitals have neonatal units, or it might be harmful to move the infant immediately. Clearly, the intent is not to protect newborns but to stir outrage.

This bill is a solution in search of a problem. It is unnecessary, redundant, and part of a broader attack on women's health and reproductive rights from this Chamber and the Trump administration.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which I proudly cosponsored.

This week, we are reminded of our Nation's most vulnerable people as we solemnly remember the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision. Unfortunately, abortion has resulted in the deliberate death of too many babies, including babies born alive. We must protect these children.

Today, by this bill, we do protect these children who are born after a botched abortion attempt.

The CDC reported that, during a 12-year period, over 370 babies died after being born alive during a termination of pregnancy. The intentional neglect of care for these lives is unconscionable.

We must respect mothers and their children by ensuring necessary medical care is given to babies born alive after a failed abortion attempt. How hard is that?

Any doctor denying care to these newborns must be held criminally accountable. This legislation does that.

Madam Speaker, it is our duty to protect all lives, and I took an oath to do just that.

□ 1015

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on so many issues.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this bill, which is really just another attempt to criminalize abortion and limit access to the full range of reproductive healthcare for women.

This so-called Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is another cynical attack on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. It is unnecessary and it simply pitches a false narrative to the American people in order to intimidate women and providers.

Madam Speaker, in 2002, Congress passed a bill with broad bipartisan support that acknowledges the rights of any child born alive in this country, and affirms that any infant should receive appropriate medical care. That is a given, and everyone believes that.

Republicans are distorting the truth about current law. This legislation before us is a step too far. It interferes with medical practice by enforcing extreme new standards of care through criminal and civil penalties on providers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. In conclusion, I would just like to say that no woman should have a politician interfering in her personal health decisions. They should be made between her and her medical provider, period.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this very cynical and sinister bill and to get out of the business of interfering in women's health.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), who is also a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, as have many of my colleagues.

I find it interesting to hear from the party that brought us the Affordable Care Act about the government interfering with healthcare decisions. But that isn't what I want to talk about today.

I want to talk about the horrendous practice of sitting and watching a child that was born alive die and not providing them care. The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 says every infant who is born alive, at any stage of development, is a human being. However, there is no law right now that criminalizes the act of abortionists who deny care to babies who survive abortions.

These fragile young lives need care immediately once they are born, which is why I strongly support this legislation. It not only requires appropriate care for children who survive abortions, but it also establishes strong criminal penalties for those who violate the law, including punishing those who intentionally kill a child born alive. Again, I think that is a violation of the Federal murder laws. You are intentionally letting a child die, and you could help. You are a doctor. You are trained.

As a strong supporter of life, it is important that we hold those who kill innocent children accountable for what they do. I believe this law will do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to please join me in supporting this important legislation to protect the lives of our newborn babies.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

This should not be a controversial vote. This bill should pass unanimously.

If a little girl is born alive, she should be protected. It is that simple.

Everyone in this House, everyone hearing my voice, was at a point of just having been born, and all of us had a right to live at that point, whether we were wanted or not.

I wonder what the great pro-life Democrats of yesterday would think of what we are hearing from the other side today, pro-life leaders like Eunice Kennedy Shriver; Sargent Shriver; Thomas Eagleton; and, of course, the late great Governor Casey of Pennsylvania. Their rhetoric reminds me of what Governor Casey said 25 years ago:

It is a bitter irony that abortion has found a home within the Democratic Party, which claims to be a champion of the poor, despite the fact that the interests of the poor are in direct conflict with the interests and the agenda of the abortion industry.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple bill. Please vote for humanity. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his extraordinary leadership and for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4712.

In the past year, the usual Republican stream of anti-woman, anti-choice policies has turned into a flood.

Today's vile bill is based on myths and lies and is designed to intimidate doctors from providing abortions.

I would like to remind my colleagues that for 45 years, the Supreme Court has upheld a woman's constitutional right to access a legal abortion, and that current law already protects infants, as well it should.

But Republicans would rather play politics with women's lives than rely on science and the law.

This bill seeks to criminalize legal medical services and put extreme, anti-choice ideology between a woman and her doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, in what other circumstance would we ever tolerate denying, delaying, or interfering with legitimate and legal medical care?

This must stop.

Protect women from this political charade. Allow doctors to take care of their patients.

Please vote "no" on this unfair, vile bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be arguing, and have been arguing, that there is no reason for this bill, that we already have a law on the books to protect children who are born alive.

I was here back in 2002 when the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of

2002 was enacted. However, that law did not criminalize the actions of abortionists who deny care to babies who survive abortions. Not only do abortion providers not provide care to children who are born alive, some are known to actively prevent their lives from proceeding.

This legislation not only requires appropriate care to be given to any child who survives an attempted abortion, but it also establishes strong criminal penalties for violating such a requirement.

I believe it is important to note that the mother of a child is in no way being prosecuted under this legislation, and women are not being targeted.

On this 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BANKS).

Mr. BANKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, anyone who believes in human rights should support giving care to every infant born alive, even after an abortion attempt.

This bill ensures that any child who is born as the result of an attempted abortion—a child who is literally outside of the mother's womb—is cared for just like any other newborn baby.

Regardless of our differences on the issue of life, I think all of us can come together to protect the lives of children who are already born.

We have seen horrible cases where the lives of children were ended immediately after being born, or even neglected and left to die, as in Kermit Gosnell's clinic.

Today I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and protect our Nation's children from violence by voting for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4712.

This act is a continuation of the House Republicans' decadelong attempt to rob women of their constitutional right to safe, legal abortion care. The bill we are considering today, however, takes these attacks on women a step further.

H.R. 4712 seeks to supersede doctors' professional judgments, imposing unnecessary, and potentially harmful, new standards of care. Violation of these extreme standards will result in harsh criminal penalties.

This bill seeks to intimidate doctors. If passed, it will discourage them from providing care and make it harder for patients to receive the help they need.

That is why it is opposed by respected medical organizations, such as the American College of Obstetricians

and Gynecologists, the American Society of Reproductive Medicine, the National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, and many others.

It is simple: healthcare decisions should be between a woman and her doctor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, again, it is simple: healthcare decisions should be between a woman and her doctor.

Politicians are not medical experts and have no place interfering with the provision of compassionate, evidence-based care.

Madam Speaker, I am an attorney and you can trust me with a lot of things, but a medical decision on someone else's behalf is not one of them.

As we mark the 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we should be advancing policies that help women and families, rather than restricting access to healthcare they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4712.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, as a father of 4 and now 16 grandchildren, I strongly support the sanctity of human life, and I believe that life begins at conception. Madam Speaker, a person is a person, no matter how small.

Whether a baby is still in the womb, if a child is born prematurely, or even if a child is born alive following an attempted abortion, they still have a life that is worth protecting.

Therefore, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 4712, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, sponsored by my good friend, Representative MARSHA BLACKBURN. This bill will be so much to protect our most vulnerable. I will continue to support legislation and advocate for those who cannot advocate for themselves.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I stand here to oppose this deadly legislation being proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

When I was 15 years old—and that was in the days before abortion was legal—I found a friend bleeding to death because of a back-alley abortion. Those were the days that when a woman needed an abortion, she would rely on coat hangers and poison.

This bill is going to take us back to those deadly days. Its aim is to intimidate doctors and threaten their own freedom if they dare to use their own medical judgment, with the consent of a patient, to perform what is now a legal abortion.

Madam Speaker, I stand and I urge my colleagues to oppose this deadly legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the lead sponsor of this important bill, who has been such a fierce advocate for the unborn.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for her leadership on this issue.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to say I would be hopeful that you all would take a few minutes and actually read this legislation. It is not a lengthy bill. It doesn't take that long to read. Quite precisely, it does a few simple things that need to be done, that need to be done to build on the 2002 law that this body chose to pass and put on the books.

Now, the reason that we chose to do this is because of what we have learned since 2002. If you go in and look at the Kermit Gosnell trial and that house of horrors, and if you take the time to listen to some of this testimony, there was a healthcare worker who said, during the years of working in that facility, that there could have been as many as 100 babies who survived a botched abortion. And what happened? They lost their life.

So this bill is about protecting women and babies. It is not about *Roe v. Wade*. It is all about protecting women and babies. It gives that mother who has that abortion, and it is botched, and that baby survives—it gives her that civil right of action that she ought to have. It does set that standard that you have got to have medical care provided to these precious, precious babies who survive that. You do that immediately. They deserve that standard of care.

It says if a healthcare professional does not make the choice to provide that care, they are going to face those criminal penalties.

So, yes, the bill is there to protect women and these babies.

I just had a great conversation with a young lady who survived an abortion. She is an adult now. She stands for life. I encourage this body to support the bill and to pass the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the other side is ready to close?

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I end this debate by reiterating the point I made at the beginning. This legislation would do nothing to enhance protections or the quality of healthcare if an infant is born after an attempted abortion.

The 2002 law reaffirmed that it has always been, and is now, against the law to intentionally kill or harm a newborn infant whatever the circumstances of its birth.

The other side has referred several times to the case of Dr. Gosnell. Dr.

Gosnell is now in jail under a sentence of life imprisonment without parole, plus 30 years, convicted of first-degree murder without this bill, because it is already against the law not to give proper care or, God forbid, to murder a baby born alive.

The law already requires the highest standard of care for all newborns. This bill does nothing new to protect infants in any respect.

The bill, however, is not harmless. Rather, by demanding the immediate transportation of the newborn to a hospital, regardless of the medical or other circumstances, it would place the lives and health of some newborn infants at risk.

The bill directly interferes with a doctor's medical judgment and dictates a particular course of action that may be harmful to the newborn in the particular circumstances. That is why a coalition of 13 healthcare provider groups, joined by a coalition of 25 additional health, civil rights, and women's rights groups, strongly opposes this bill. As the providers note, the bill wrongly "injects politicians into the patient-physician relationship, disregarding providers' training and clinical judgment and undermining their ability to determine the best course of action with their patients."

Let me add one other thing. This bill does not interfere, in any way, with the rights secured by the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade*. That decision guarantees the right of a woman to choose an abortion if she wishes.

It does not, nor does any other law or any other provision, negate the command of the law that everyone respects that any newborn child, whatever the circumstances of its birth, must be cared for in the best possible medical way, and, of course, deliberately killing it would be first-degree murder.

This bill does not change this, but this bill does do harm by presenting risk to certain newborns by demanding their immediate transport to the hospital when it may be harmful to their health to do so.

We should listen to the healthcare professionals, we should respect their judgment, and the House must reject this seriously flawed bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Of course, like so many of my colleagues, I support this measure, but it feels really strange standing here today in defense of living, breathing children, to have to make a case that a baby who survives an abortion and is born into this world should be treated just like a baby born any other way, but, unfortunately, we must.

There is currently no law mandating that a baby born alive after a failed abortion receive medical treatment instead of being left to die. That is why we are here, to require, under Federal law nationwide, that a baby born alive after an abortion attempt receives the

same care that any other baby would receive.

So finally my question, Madam Speaker, to those who would oppose such a measure is this: How is the life of one baby any different or less valuable than the life of another baby? How does anyone justify that?

I know that, as Members of Congress, part of our job is to debate with each other about issues facing our Nation. I take that job responsibility very seriously. I just don't believe this particular issue is up for debate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4712. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. With this bill, the Majority has declared war on the health and wellbeing of millions of women, rolling back women's health care. The bill's inflammatory language is an insult to women and the doctors who provide them with care.

This legislation is redundant, and would criminalize the work that doctors do legally today. This would unnecessarily intimidate healthcare providers like Planned Parenthood, who serve 2.4 million Americans every year with lifesaving services like pap tests, breast exams, and screenings for sexually transmitted infections. For many low-income families, Planned Parenthood is their only option.

Family planning is a critical component of women's economic security. Being able to determine when and how to have children has a direct effect on a working woman's ability to chart their course in terms of schooling, careers, and family. These decisions should be left to women, their loved ones, and doctors.

This bill is spiteful, mean-spirited, and dangerous. It limits women's healthcare choices and interferes with the patient doctor relationship—in fact, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists call this legislation, and I quote “a gross interference in the practice of medicine.”

The Congress should not stop women from accessing care, and we certainly should not be hindering a woman's ability to make her own healthcare decisions. We ought to be protecting the rights of every woman to make her own family planning decisions, and to have access to a full range of healthcare services. I urge my colleagues to reject this partisan, cruel bill.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

There is no question that the rule of law should require medical practitioners to treat babies born alive after a failed abortion with the same care they would treat any baby born at that same gestational age.

Everyone in this body should agree that it is inhumane to willingly kill a baby who has been born alive. It's time to end this repugnant practice.

Unfortunately, the left spread the lie that pro-life Republicans only care about life when it's in the womb and not once it's born—However, the bill before us is about protecting the born and alive and nearly all of its support comes from Republicans.

No human being should be treated with such violence.

Let's pass this bill and end this horrendous and unthinkable act.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4712, the latest attempt by House Republicans to come between physicians and their patients.

H.R. 4712 amends the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 (P.L. No: 107–207) which I voted for because it codified current law. Unfortunately, H.R. 4712 amends the bipartisan Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, injecting partisan politics into the healthcare decisions of women and their physicians.

H.R. 4712 would overrule medical professionals by forcing that a newborn infant be transported to a hospital regardless of whether that would be best for the infant's health. Not only is this a dangerous intrusion into the medical decision-making of doctors, but it also may endanger infant health. Even if it is in the best interest of the infant's health, if a doctor violates this law's mandate, automatic criminal penalties of prison time, crippling fines, or both would be applied to that medical professional.

Although supporters of this bill claim that their intentions are only to protect newborn infants from medical negligence, the true objectives of this legislation are clear: spread misinformation about women's reproductive health and to dissuade medical professionals from entering the practice of abortion services.

This legislation is unnecessary. Today, abortion practice is safe, legal, and highly regulated to ensure that the best possible care is provided to a woman. Existing law ensures that medical professionals meet these standards. Let me be clear, an individual who performs illegal abortion services should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I join all Members of Congress and all Americans in opposition to the horrific actions of Dr. Kermit Gosnell. There is no dispute that Dr. Gosnell deserved to be prosecuted, found guilty, and face the multiple life sentences that he is now serving due to the laws already in place in Pennsylvania and throughout the nation.

Unfortunately, H.R. 4712 is yet another assault by the Trump Administration and Congressional Republicans on women's reproductive health. Congress' most basic responsibility is funding the government and today we are facing a government shutdown. I urge my Republican colleagues to stop playing politics with women's health and get back to addressing the urgent needs of the American people like keeping the government open.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 4712.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 694, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 705

Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

Resolved, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is unfit to be President, unfit to represent the American values of decency and morality, respectability and civility, honesty and propriety, reputability and integrity, is unfit to defend the ideals that have made America great, unfit to defend liberty and justice for all as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance, is unfit to defend the American ideal of all persons being created equal as exalted in the Declaration of Independence, is unfit to ensure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity as lauded in the preamble to the United States Constitution, is unfit to protect government of the people, by the people, for the people as elucidated in the Gettysburg Address, and is impeached for high misdemeanors, and that the following article of impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:

Article of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States, in the name of itself and of the people of the United States, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high misdemeanors committed as President constituting harm to American society to the manifest injury of the people of the United States:

ARTICLE I

In his capacity as President of the United States, unmindful of the high duties of his high office, of the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, and respect necessary for stability within the society of the United States, Donald John Trump has with his bigoted statements done more than simply insult individuals and groups of Americans, he has harmed the American society by attempting to convert his bigoted statements into United States policy and by associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry on one or more of the following occasions:

On January 27, 2017, Donald John Trump issued Executive Order 13769 providing for a partial shutdown of immigration from mainly Muslim countries to fulfill a bigoted campaign promise that read as follows: “DONALD J. TRUMP STATEMENT ON PREVENTING MUSLIM IMMIGRATION (New York, NY) December 7th, 2015—Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what's going on,” thereby attempting to convert a bigoted campaign promise into United States policy, associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt upon Muslims, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of religion.

On July 26, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: After consulting with my Generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve in

any capacity in the U.S. Military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statement into United States policy, associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, thereby casting contempt on transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of gender.

On August 15, 2017, Donald John Trump made a widely-published statement characterizing a group of anti-Semites, bigots, racists, white nationalists, and Ku Klux Klansmen who rallied in Charlottesville, Virginia, as “very fine people,” thereby associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry.

On October 7, 2017, hate groups returned to Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting “You will not replace us!” after having chanted in their August Charlottesville rally that “Jews will not replace us!”. Since this event on October 7, the President has made widely-published statements about many issues, including the National Football League, but has not made one widely-published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

On January 11, 2018, Donald John Trump held a meeting with a bipartisan group of Congressional leaders that focused primarily on legislation that would provide a statutory protected status for individuals brought to the United States without documentation. At this meeting, as has been widely-published, Donald John Trump made references to people from s-h-i-t-h-o-l-e (or s-h-i-t-h-o-u-s-e) countries. He also questioned why we need more Haitians or people from African countries, proclaiming that we should take them out. Donald John Trump then suggested that Norwegians were better suited to be immigrants to this country, thereby casting contempt on citizens and noncitizens who were welcomed here by previous Presidents due to natural disaster and civil unrest, thereby attempting to convert his bigoted statements into United States policy, associating the presidency and the people of the United States with bigotry, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of national origin.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace and disrepute, has sown discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President, and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump by causing such harm to the society of the United States is unfit to be President and warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to lay the resolution on the table will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 4712, and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 66, answered “present” 3, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—355

Abraham	Crist	Hice, Jody B.
Aderholt	Crowley	Higgins (LA)
Agular	Cuellar	Hill
Allen	Culberson	Himes
Amash	Curbelo (FL)	Holding
Amodei	Curtis	Hollingsworth
Babin	Davidson	Hoyer
Bacon	Davis (CA)	Hudson
Banks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Huizenga
Barletta	DeFazio	Hultgren
Barr	DeGette	Hunter
Barton	Delaney	Hurd
Bera	DeLauro	Issa
Bergman	DelBene	Jenkins (KS)
Beyer	Demings	Jenkins (WV)
Biggs	Denham	Johnson (GA)
Bilirakis	Dent	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (GA)	DeSantis	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (MI)	DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Deutch	Jones
Black	Diaz-Balart	Jordan
Blackburn	Dingell	Joyce (OH)
Blum	Donovan	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	Katko
Blunt Rochester	F.	Keating
Bonamici	Duffy	Kelly (MS)
Bost	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Boyle, Brendan	Duncan (TN)	Kennedy
F.	Dunn	Khanna
Brady (TX)	Emmer	Kihuen
Brat	Eshoo	Kildee
Bridenstine	Estes (KS)	Kilmer
Brooks (AL)	Esty (CT)	Kind
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	King (IA)
Brown (MD)	Faso	King (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Ferguson	Kinzinger
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Knight
Buck	Fleischmann	Krishnamoorthi
Bucshon	Flores	Kuster (NH)
Budd	Fortenberry	Kustoff (TN)
Burgess	Foster	Labrador
Bustos	Fox	LaHood
Byrne	Frelinghuysen	LaMalfa
Calvert	Gabbard	Lamborn
Carbajal	Gaetz	Lance
Cárdenas	Gallagher	Langevin
Carter (GA)	Galleo	Larsen (WA)
Carter (TX)	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Gianforte	Latta
Castor (FL)	Gibbs	Lawson (FL)
Chabot	Gohmert	Levin
Cheney	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis (MN)
Chu, Judy	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Ciilline	Gosar	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Loeb
Clyburn	Govt	Loeb
Coffman	Granger	Lofgren
Cole	Graves (GA)	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Love
Comer	Green, Gene	Lowey
Comstock	Griffith	Lucas
Conaway	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Connolly	Guthrie	Lujan Grisham,
Cook	Hanabusa	M.
Cooper	Handel	Luján, Ben Ray
Correa	Harper	Lynch
Costa	Harris	MacArthur
Costello (PA)	Hartzler	Maloney,
Courtney	Heck	Carolyn B.
Cramer	Hensarling	Maloney, Sean
Crawford	Herrera Beutler	Marchant
		Marino

Marshall	Ratcliffe	Smith (WA)
Massie	Reed	Smucker
Mast	Renacci	Soto
Matsui	Rice (NY)	Speier
McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Stefanik
McCaul	Roby	Stewart
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Stivers
McEachin	Rogers (AL)	Suozi
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Swalwell (CA)
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Takano
McMorris	Rokita	Taylor
Rodgers	Rooney, Francis	Tenney
McSally	Rooney, Thomas	Thompson (CA)
Meadows	J.	Thompson (PA)
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Meeks	Rosen	Tipton
Meng	Roskam	Tonko
Messer	Ross	Torres
Mitchell	Rothfus	Trott
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Tsongas
Mooney (WV)	Roybal-Allard	Turner
Mullin	Royce (CA)	Upton
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Valadao
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Neal	Russell	Wagner
Newhouse	Rutherford	Walberg
Noem	Ryan (OH)	Walden
Nolan	Sánchez	Walker
Norman	Sanford	Walorski
Nunes	Sarbanes	Walters, Mimi
O'Halleran	Schiff	Wasserman
O'Rourke	Schneider	Schultz
Olson	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Palazzo	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Palmer	Scott (VA)	Welch
Panetta	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Pearce	Sessions	Williams
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (SC)
Perlmutter	Shimkus	Wittman
Perry	Shuster	Womack
Peters	Simpson	Woodall
Peterson	Sinema	Yarmuth
Pittenger	Sires	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Slaughter	Yoho
Poliquin	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)
Posey	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Zeldin
Quigley	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—66

Adams	Grijalva	Pallone
Barragán	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bass	Hastings	Payne
Beatty	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Pocan
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Polis
Capuano	Jayapal	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Clay	Lawrence	Scott, David
Cohen	Lee	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Lowenthal	Titus
Engel	McCormack	Vargas
Espallat	McGovern	Vela
Evans	McNerney	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Walz
Garamendi	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Gomez	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Green, Al	Norcross	Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Castro (TX)	Shea-Porter	Veasey
-------------	-------------	--------

NOT VOTING—6

Arrington	Davis, Danny	Reichert
Cummings	Fudge	Scalise

□ 1116

Mses. CLARKE of New York and VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MATSUI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. MCKINLEY, SMUCKER, Ms. KAPTUR, Messrs. RYAN of Ohio, LYNCH, MEEKS, and BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 4712) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 183, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—241

Abraham	Farenthold	LoBiondo
Aderholt	Faso	Long
Allen	Ferguson	Loudermilk
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Love
Amodel	Fleischmann	Lucas
Arrington	Flores	Luetkemeyer
Babin	Fortenberry	MacArthur
Bacon	Fox	Marchant
Banks (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Marino
Barletta	Gaetz	Marshall
Barr	Gallagher	Massie
Barton	Garrett	Mast
Bergman	Gianforte	McCarthy
Biggs	Gibbs	McCaul
Bilirakis	Gohmert	McClintock
Bishop (MI)	Goodlatte	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gosar	McKinley
Black	Gowdy	McMorris
Blackburn	Granger	Rodgers
Blum	Graves (GA)	McSally
Bost	Graves (LA)	Meadows
Brady (TX)	Graves (MO)	Meehan
Brat	Griffith	Messer
Bridenstine	Grothman	Mitchell
Brooks (AL)	Guthrie	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Handel	Mooney (WV)
Buchanan	Harper	Mullin
Buck	Harris	Newhouse
Bucshon	Hartzler	Noem
Budd	Hensarling	Norman
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Byrne	Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Carter (GA)	Hill	Palmer
Carter (TX)	Holding	Paulsen
Cartwright	Hollingsworth	Pearce
Chabot	Hudson	Perry
Cheney	Huizenga	Peterson
Coffman	Hultgren	Pittenger
Cole	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Collins (GA)	Hurd	Poliquin
Collins (NY)	Issa	Posey
Comer	Jenkins (KS)	Ratcliffe
Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Reed
Conaway	Johnson (LA)	Renacci
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cramer	Jones	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	Katko	Rohrabacher
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Rokita
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Francis
Davidson	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	J.
Denham	Kinzinger	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Knight	Roskam
DeSantis	Kustoff (TN)	Ross
DesJarlais	Labrador	Rothfus
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Rouzer
Donovan	LaMalfa	Royce (CA)
Duffy	Lamborn	Russell
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Rutherford
Duncan (TN)	Langevin	Sanford
Dunn	Latta	Schweikert
Emmer	Lewis (MN)	Scott, Austin
Estes (KS)	Lipinski	Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez

Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Loebuck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross

O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Bass
Cummings

Davis, Danny
Fudge

Reichert
Scalise

□ 1126

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 36, H.R. 4712, I intended to vote "no" when I accidentally voted "yes."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 1, noes 418, answered "present" 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

AYES—1

Massie

NOES—418

Abraham	Cohen	Garamendi
Adams	Cole	Garrett
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Gianforte
Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Allen	Comer	Gohmert
Amash	Comstock	Gomez
Amodel	Conaway	Gonzalez (TX)
Arrington	Connolly	Goodlatte
Babin	Cook	Gosar
Bacon	Cooper	Gottheimer
Banks (IN)	Correa	Gowdy
Barletta	Costa	Granger
Barr	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Barragán	Courtney	Graves (LA)
Barton	Cramer	Graves (MO)
Beatty	Crawford	Green, Al
Bera	Crist	Green, Gene
Bergman	Crowley	Griffith
Beyer	Cuellar	Grothman
Biggs	Culberson	Guthrie
Bilirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Curtis	Hanabusa
Bishop (MI)	Davidson	Handel
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Harper
Black	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Blackburn	DeFazio	Hartzler
Blum	DeGette	Hastings
Blumenauer	Delaney	Heck
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Hensarling
Bonamici	DelBene	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Demings	Hice, Jody B.
Boyle, Brendan	Denham	Higgins (LA)
F.	Dent	Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Hill
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Brat	DesJarlais	Holding
Bridenstine	Deutch	Hollingsworth
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Hudson
Brown (MD)	Doggett	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	Donovan	Huizenga
Buchanan	Doyle, Michael	Hultgren
Buck	F.	Hunter
Bucshon	Duffy	Hurd
Budd	Duncan (SC)	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Jayapal
Bustos	Dunn	Jeffries
Butterfield	Ellison	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Emmer	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Engel	Johnson (LA)
Capuano	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Carbajal	Españillat	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Estes (KS)	Johnson, Sam
Carson (IN)	Esty (CT)	Jones
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Faso	Kaptur
Cartwright	Ferguson	Katko
Castor (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Castro (TX)	Fleischmann	Kelly (IL)
Chabot	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Cheney	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Chu, Judy	Foster	Kennedy
Cicilline	Fox	Khanna
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kihuen
Clarke (NY)	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Clay	Gabbard	Kilmer
Cleaver	Gaetz	Kind
Clyburn	Gallagher	King (IA)
Coffman	Gallego	King (NY)

Kinzing	Noem	Sessions
Knight	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Krishnamoorthi	Norcross	Shea-Porter
Kuster (NH)	Norman	Sherman
Kustoff (TN)	Nunes	Shimkus
Labrador	O'Halleran	Shuster
LaHood	O'Rourke	Simpson
LaMalfa	Olson	Sinema
Lamborn	Palazzo	Sires
Lance	Pallone	Slaughter
Langevin	Palmer	Smith (MO)
Larsen (WA)	Panetta	Smith (NE)
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
Latta	Paulsen	Smith (TX)
Lawrence	Payne	Smith (WA)
Lawson (FL)	Pearce	Smucker
Lee	Pelosi	Soto
Levin	Perlmutter	Speier
Lewis (GA)	Perry	Stefanik
Lewis (MN)	Peters	Stewart
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Stivers
Lipinski	Pingree	Suozzi
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Swalwell (CA)
Loeback	Pocan	Takano
Lofgren	Poe (TX)	Taylor
Long	Poliquin	Tenney
Loudermilk	Polis	Thompson (CA)
Love	Posey	Thompson (MS)
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Thompson (PA)
Lowey	Quigley	Thornberry
Lucas	Raskin	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Titus
Lujan Grisham,	Reed	Tonko
M.	Renacci	Torres
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Trott
Lynch	Rice (SC)	Tsongas
MacArthur	Richmond	Turner
Maloney,	Roby	Upton
Carolyn B.	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Maloney, Sean	Rogers (AL)	Vargas
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Veasey
Marino	Rohrabacher	Vela
Marshall	Rokita	Velázquez
Mast	Rooney, Francis	Visclosky
Matsui	Rooney, Thomas	Wagner
McCarthy	J.	Walberg
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
McClintock	Rosen	Walker
McCollum	Roskam	Walorski
McEachin	Ross	Walters, Mimi
McGovern	Rothfus	Walz
McHenry	Rouzer	Wasserman
McKinley	Roybal-Allard	Schultz
McMorris	Royce (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Rodgers	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Weber (TX)
McSally	Rush	Webster (FL)
Meadows	Russell	Welch
Meehan	Rutherford	Wenstrup
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Westerman
Meng	Sánchez	Williams
Messer	Sanford	Wilson (FL)
Mitchell	Sarbanes	Wilson (SC)
Moolenaar	Schakowsky	Wittman
Mooney (WV)	Schiff	Womack
Moore	Schneider	Woodall
Moulton	Schrader	Yarmuth
Mullin	Schweikert	Yoder
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	Yoho
Nadler	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)
Napolitano	Scott, David	Young (IA)
Neal	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin
Newhouse	Serrano	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Evans

NOT VOTING—10

Bass	Grijalva	Reichert
Cummings	Issa	Scalise
Davis, Danny	Jenkins (WV)	
Fudge	Joyce (OH)	

□ 1143

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

DEMOCRATS ARE AVAILABLE TO DO THE PEOPLE'S WORK

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, we are confronting a very serious situation, as all of us know, and that is we have not reached agreement on how to fund the government between now and September 30 of this year.

Almost one-third of fiscal year 2018 is gone. At some point in time—the majority leader is not available right now, therefore, I am not asking him to yield, because he has something important that he is doing now—but at some point in time, Madam Speaker, I am hoping that the majority leader will come before us and we can have a colloquy on what we intend to do during the course of this day, perhaps tomorrow, perhaps Sunday, perhaps Monday, perhaps Tuesday, in order to get the business of the country done.

I am urging my Members to be available on very short notice so that they can complete the work of funding our government for fiscal year 2018. I hope that all other Members will be available to do so as well. That is our responsibility. We have not yet met that responsibility. Therefore, I want to give notice to my Members that we need to be here.

The Senate has not acted. We do not know what they will do. We need to be available for their action. I know the majority leader suggested that it was okay to leave and go home. I want to make it clear that is not my view. We have not completed our work. The American public expects us to do that.

I would hope that we would all remain available to complete the work of funding the government between now and fiscal year 2018 ending, of course, on September 30.

PRO-LIFE YOUTH ARE LEADERS OF TOMORROW

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the sanctity of human life and to redouble my commitment to protecting the most vulnerable among us: the unborn.

Today, more than 100,000 pro-lifers from across the country are in Washington, D.C., for the 45th annual March for Life. This year's theme is: "Love Saves Lives." And, Madam Speaker, it surely does. Thanks to the pro-life movement, abortion rates across the country are at the lowest since 2013.

Today's march is one of the best events of the year, and I am always

pleased to see so many young people standing for life. They are the leaders of tomorrow. And to see so many individuals here today, standing for what they believe in, truly gives me great hope for the future of the pro-life movement.

We must always be a voice for the voiceless, and we continue to build a culture that values lives and respects mothers and their children.

Madam Speaker, we all know that "Love Saves Lives."

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS EMMANUEL MENSAH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, last month, 12 people died in a raging inferno that tore through an apartment building in the Bronx.

I rise today to honor the life of Army Private First Class Emmanuel Mensah, a 28-year-old man who repeatedly ran into that burning building to rescue his neighbors. This decorated young American soldier lived by the Army's values: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. Private Mensah lived and died by these values in selfless service to his community.

Madam Speaker, Private Mensah's life exemplifies the best of our Nation. His tragic death teaches us that every life has value, every life has meaning, and every life is worth protecting.

Madam Speaker, Private First Class Emmanuel Mensah was not only a brave and courageous American soldier, he was also an immigrant from the African nation of Ghana. Let us honor his life by keeping the gates of liberty open to immigrants like him.

MARCH FOR LIFE

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, thousands from across the country will descend on our Nation's Capital for the 45th annual March for Life, the largest pro-life rally in the world.

The March for Life is held annually in response to the ruling in *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that altered the course of our American culture. On January 22, 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court decided in a 7-2 opinion to roll back restrictions on abortion in the U.S. Since that ruling, over 58 million human lives have been lost to abortion nationwide.

While a number of States have enacted regulations preventing late-term abortions, the United States is one of only seven countries, which includes the dictatorships of North Korea and China, that allows abortions after 20 weeks from the date of gestation. Earlier this year, the House passed the

Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act to end this egregious practice.

One of the most important struggles we face as a compassionate society, as legislators, and as citizens is to protect the sanctity of life and defend future generations. As a mother, it is among my top priorities to advance pro-life and pro-women policies in Congress, and I will continue to promote a culture that respects the most precious gift of all, the gift of life.

HONORING STEPHANIE OHIGASHI, MILDRED OKUDA, AND TOM FUJITA, JAPANESE CULTURAL SOCIETY OF MAUI

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has long enjoyed a special and unique relationship with Japan, and Hawaii's Japanese-American community has been integral in shaping our history and collective story.

I rise today to recognize three special leaders: Stephanie Ohigashi, Mildred Okuda, and Tom Fujita, three members of the Japanese Cultural Society of Maui, who, for decades, have been dedicated to preserving Japanese culture and heritage in the County of Maui.

These three leaders have gone above and beyond working to strengthen ties between Hawaii and Japan and their service to Maui's community. They have worked to create a sister-city relationship between Maui County and Fukuyama City, organize cross-cultural and educational opportunities, cultivate the stories and history of the first Japanese immigrants to Hawaii, and so much more.

In recognition of their many contributions and legacies, they have each been selected for awards from the Japanese Cultural Society of Maui.

"Thanks," "Mahalo," to Stephanie, Mildred, and Tom for your service to the people of Hawaii.

DETECTIVE MICHAEL R. DOTY, SOUTH CAROLINA LAWMAN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, bruised and battered Christian McCall's wife called the police, reporting that her husband was engaging in domestic abuse.

So, on January 17, Detective Michael Doty and three other deputies who wear the badge responded to the call for help. After beating up his wife, the scoundrel took off, running away from the police. What followed was a 3-hour manhunt for the outlaw.

As the law officers closed in on his trail, shots rang out from McCall. Sergeants Randy Clinton, Buddy Brown, and Kyle Cummings were all shot during the chase. We thank the good Lord that they are expected to make a full recovery. Detective Michael Doty was

also shot and killed. This is his photograph.

Detective Doty was a member of the thin blue line leaving the world too soon. He was 37 years old and a 12-year veteran of the York County Sheriff's Department in South Carolina. He and his twin brother enlisted in the force at the same time. Doty dedicated his life to protecting and serving. He previously worked in the drug enforcement unit as a member of the SWAT team.

As his body was transported to the medical center, fellow officers lined the streets in tribute to him. He was an officer every agency would be proud to have. Each and every day, we are grateful to have officers like Michael Doty.

The shooter was captured and he will face justice.

America's peace officers do America's dirty work. They root out evil and go after those who would do us harm. Officers like Michael Doty are the rare breed who give their lives for the rest of us. And for that, we are grateful.

And that is just the way it is.

SAVE THIS NATION

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear to my colleagues and the American people why there is a major debate in the other body.

This is not a shutdown campaign. What we need to understand is that this is not a shutdown for illegal immigration. I am offended by that terminology.

The DREAMers have status. Their status was taken away by the President. What we are trying to do is ensure individuals who are in the United States, in the United States military, teaching, and committed to this Nation, have dignity.

Relatives of my friends on the other side of the aisle may have come in undocumented or without status. Therefore, this is not about illegal immigration. It is about dignity and respect for people here in the United States.

It is about my constituents who are suffering after Hurricane Harvey with no heat and their homes not being rehabilitated because we do not have disaster supplemental funding.

It is about federally qualified health clinics, Mr. Speaker, that will be shut down because we have no funding—zero—in the CR so babies can go and get care.

Finally, it is about the Department of Education, teachers, and our law enforcement, whom we have such respect for.

This shutdown is not a campaign; it is a high calling to save this Nation. I stand with them.

□ 1200

ANNOUNCED BONUSES

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the immediate benefits that H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, is already delivering for American families.

Soon after it was signed into law, a number of large companies had already announced large bonuses for their employees, crediting the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. For example, American Airlines, AT&T, JetBlue, Nationwide, and Southwest Airlines all announced \$1,000 bonuses for their hardworking employees. Other companies that announced bonuses include AFLAC, Wells Fargo, and SunTrust, and I expect more to join this list.

With an administration and Congress that support American businesses, we are not only seeing numbers of high consumer confidence and low unemployment, but we are watching the direct benefits that our policies are having on American families.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing how our Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will continue to benefit Americans throughout 2018.

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD REMAIN OPEN FOR ALL

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the cause of any government shutdown now will be the same as in the past: Republican intransigence. If they continue to insist upon an entirely partisan bill that excludes DREAMers, they should not expect Democratic votes.

I want the government to remain open for everyone, including our DREAMers. While Republicans firmly control all levers of government, they can't keep it operating.

They will make history, celebrating the first anniversary of Donald Trump's incompetence by shutting down the government that they totally control themselves. Instead of staying here to work toward a bipartisan solution, they are moving to shut down the House first.

It is the height of irresponsibility. It shows the depths of mismanagement that has failed to produce a simple one-year resolution to continue the operation of our government.

We must speak out about the wrong that is being committed here. Defend our DREAMers. Defend the continuation of our government and a more responsible approach in this new year.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National School Choice Week and talk about the importance of choice for parents when deciding where to send their kids.

For millions of families, their local public school simply cannot provide the education that their child needs. For instance, recovery schools create a safe environment for students who are struggling with addiction to drugs and alcohol.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood and Secondary Education, I accompanied Secretary DeVos last September when she visited the H.O.P.E. Academy, a recovery school located in Indianapolis, Indiana.

There, I heard the story of Jeremy, who, like many kids, wanted to fit in. One day, Jeremy reconnected with an old friend, who offered him marijuana. Before long, he was using and selling even harder drugs. Eventually, he was blacking out and was arrested. He could not find the help he needed at his local school.

Thankfully, he and his parents found and enrolled in H.O.P.E. Academy. Because of H.O.P.E. Academy, Jeremy got clean, enrolled in seminary, and met his wife. Just 1 year ago, they welcomed their first child.

It is because of these stories, and so many others, Mr. Speaker, that I fully support the right of parents to find the school that works best for them and their kids.

ABORTION BAN

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, we are close to a government shutdown. The Republicans' top priority, however, is taking away a woman's right to choose.

The abortion survivors bill is nothing but an insensitive, insulting, and unconstitutional attack against a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. No matter how sneaky the Republicans have been in drafting this bill, it is still, plain and simple, an abortion ban. It criminalizes doctors and intrudes into the doctor-patient relationship.

Politicians are choosing what is best for a woman's health, instead of a woman making a choice with her doctor. This bill is part of the Republicans' agenda to take healthcare away from women.

On the eve of the Women's March, we say again: Enough is enough. This bill will intimidate and close down reproductive health clinics across the country, leaving women who truly need help with no choices at all.

READING EAGLE HISTORY

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a pillar of journalistic integrity in our democracy, the Reading Eagle, a newspaper in my district in Berks County, Penn-

sylvania. This month, the paper celebrates its 150th anniversary.

On January 28, 1868, the Reading Eagle published its first daily paper and is now one of the oldest family-owned newspapers in our country. Today, the paper operates its headquarters in downtown Reading and serves as a valuable resource for news to many of my constituents.

Congratulations to the Reading Eagle and its staff on this exciting milestone; and thank you for providing community news, great local content, national news, and providing transparency and accountability of government at all levels for the betterment of our democracy.

In spite of all of the competing sources of information and evolving technology of today, the Reading Eagle remains the greater Berks region's go-to source for reliable local news and information.

IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the many people around the country who have supported the cause of impeachment.

I rise to thank the many Members of the House. Today, 66 voted to advance the cause of impeachment. Previously, 58 voted to advance the cause.

I rise to thank all who have been supportive and who are advancing the cause to protect democracy, to protect the Republic, and to make sure that what we have is never eliminated from the face of the Earth, and that is the greatest country on the face of the Earth.

PROTECTING LIFE

(Mr. MEADOWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, today is a day where tens of thousands of people come to Washington, D.C., to march for the sanctity of life for the real purpose of speaking up for those who can't speak for themselves.

Each year, we see an unbelievable number of people coming to not only proclaim what a pro-life position is, but to come out in unison to make sure that we once again return to our roots of protecting life and knowing that every life is precious.

Sadly, much of the Main Street media will not be covering this today; but in this House, on this day, let us know that, indeed, we are still one nation under God and willing to protect life.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). The Chair will recognize

Members for Special Order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

MARCH FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives to carry on some of the discussion that is taking place around this city and around this country today on March for Life day.

It would take you back 45 years ago to January 22, 1973, when the case of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton came before the United States Supreme Court. They manufactured a legal opinion out of the emanations and conundrums to quote the decision that resulted in abortion on demand in this country. Some say abortions soared up to as many as 6 million a year in some of those years in the 1970s.

America wasn't ready for such a decision. We didn't understand, in 1973, the magnitude of the decision the Supreme Court had made. We knew that it was going to open up abortion. We suspected it would be abortion on demand. We did not expect that, 45 years later, we would be here in this city still marching, marching for life, marching to defend the lives of the innocent unborn, and praying in most, if not every single church in America, to defend innocent, unborn human life.

Some of the questions that have come before us in that period of time as two generations of Americans have grown up with the guilt of abortion, with the shadow hanging over our heads, two generations of Americans have grown up having to answer this question: Is human life sacred? Is it the value, is it the measure that we put up when we evaluate all things we do?

Our Founding Fathers understood that when they laid out the original founding document of the Declaration of Independence. They wrote that we have the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, it is no coincidence that life is first in that list, Mr. Speaker. Our Founding Fathers understood that they were prioritized rights, that the right to life is paramount and that the right to life is sacred, but that liberty comes from God. He confers his God-given liberty on us, and we have to handle it responsibly. And behind that came pursuit of happiness.

Now I will take it from the bottom up, Mr. Speaker.

Pursuit of happiness was understood differently by our Founders than I think we understand it today. It seems to me that, if you go into a high school classroom, those who have been studying our founding documents—our Declaration and our Constitution and the Federalist Papers—and ask them what does "pursuit of happiness" mean, they

might say: "Well, a good tailgate party," or "a fun time with your friends," or any one of a number of other things that they do for recreation.

But, truthfully, Mr. Speaker, that is not how our Founding Fathers looked at that pursuit of happiness. They don't even call it the rich things we draw from our families, exclusively. But they understood "pursuit of happiness" as the term is understood in Greek, which is the foundation for that term. It is the word "eudaimonia," spelled E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A.

Eudaimonia, the breadth of the pursuit of happiness, if described and understood properly, is this: It is becoming the whole human being, the whole person; developing yourself physically with the God-given bodies that we have with exercise and nutrition; developing our skill sets with the gifts that we have that are physical skills. And it includes, also, the intellectual component, where we develop our minds as far as we can, educate ourselves and fill that God-given brain up with all the information that is relevant and useful. That is the second component.

□ 1215

The third component is spiritual. They expected and called upon this pursuit of happiness, this eudaimonia—the effort to become a complete human being, a complete human being spiritually, intellectually, and physically, that was the package of eudaimonia, the pursuit of happiness—but even that couldn't trump another individual's liberty, couldn't take aside the God-given liberty to live free and be free and have free movement and rights to property and a number of those components.

So our effort to pursue happiness can't trample on someone else's God-given liberty. We understand that. You can't take away somebody's property because it makes you happy. It is a pretty simple equation. Neither, then, can a pursuit of liberty be allowed to justify the taking of a human life, because life is the highest priority.

It is always prioritized, life, liberty, pursuit of happiness; or in Burke's language, life, liberty and property. Life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is always prioritized with life as the highest priority that stands above all else.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that when you want to know how we measure, the meter, invented by a Frenchman, is set to be that 39-point-something inches, and they have a platinum meter stick that is set up so that they could have a finite measure that they keep in a controlled atmosphere so it doesn't expand or contract, and it is the most precise measurement of a meter. That is the basis for distance measuring in the metric world, most of the rest of the world. That is the basis to distance measuring.

That meter stick—that platinum meter stick is the measure itself that they measure everything else against

in components of or multiples of that meter stick.

Well, I would take you to the former Governor of Pennsylvania, Bob Casey, Sr., who has passed away and who was the father of Senator BOB CASEY. He made this statement:

Human life cannot be measured. It is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

Now, here is the comparison that I have drawn. The meter stick is the measure itself of distance, but human life is the measure of all of our values.

Human life is sacred, it is finite, and the value of life from the moment of conception until natural death is the same. We don't punish people differently when they commit murder against someone who is 101 years old versus someone who is 1 year old. Somebody who has, perhaps, a century of life ahead of them, we don't say their life is worth more than someone who almost certainly doesn't have a decade of life ahead of them, because human life is sacred and it is the measure itself against which all other things are weighed.

So once we understand that human life is sacred in all of its forms, there is only one other question to ask, and that is: At what moment does life begin? At what instant does life begin?

We can look through this whole period of human development and we can make arguments about viability and trimesters and ability to breathe or live outside the womb. Those things are always vague, you can never nail that down to anything precise, because even the Pain-Capable legislation that we passed out of this House a couple of months ago that bans abortions after 20 weeks, we say that baby can feel pain at 20 weeks, so that is abhorrent to our conscience and we reject aborting a baby that can feel pain.

We don't know whether they can feel pain prior to that or not, but that is not a precise moment. It is a relatively vague moment that is a consensus conclusion of OB/GYN doctors, perhaps, but life itself cannot be measured and neither can we take that life and say: Well, we might not have.

I have often stood in a high school or even a middle school gymnasium and talked to the youth in there whose ears and minds are open, and I asked: If someone walked by the door of this gymnasium and looked away from you and poked a gun in the door and pulled the trigger, did he kill somebody?

And they looked at each other and said: Well, we don't know.

And I said: Neither does he. But if there is somebody laying there in the bleachers that is dead, then what happened?

They said: Then we know he killed somebody.

I said: Well, can you take a chance with that? Is he guilty of murder if he poked a gun in the door and the crowd was full and he pulled the trigger and somebody died?

They said: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, so neither can we take a chance with innocent unborn human life and say it really isn't a life prior to 20 weeks, or it really isn't a life prior to viability, or it really isn't a life until the third trimester.

So what we have done in this Congress is we have brought in a number of pieces of legislation, incremental pieces of legislation to try to put an end to this killing, because the pro-life community knows and believes—all the pro-life community is convinced that life begins at that moment of conception, that instant of conception, and we have to protect that life from that moment.

Anybody who has picked up a little baby, especially if it is your own, in awe at the miracle of this little child created in God's image from the DNA of mom and dad, to be nurtured and shaped, to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to worship, to have children of his or her own, understands that miracle and how precious it is to us.

There are at least 500,000 couples in America that are waiting to adopt because they want a baby to love so badly, yet we have watched as 60 million babies have been aborted since 1973, in the last 45 years; 60 million babies weighing on the conscience of America, a sin committed by the government of our country. There have been people complicit in this that have advocated for it.

Just a little bit ago, we had the vote on the Born-Alive bill here on the floor that enhances the penalty. If an abortionist isn't successful on the first try, what they often do is put that baby in a cold room and close the door and let that baby die in that cold room. There are other more ghastly methods that get used as well.

So we moved legislation here on the floor to statutorily protect that baby that survives the abortion. In essence, what it really says in the end is this: If you try to end the life of this baby through abortion and fail, we are going to punish you if you need a second try.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is nearly enough. I think it is a start, but it is not nearly enough. Actually, we need to be accelerating our pace in incrementalism, not taking our foot off the throttle on the incremental approach to ending abortion.

So in 45 years, 2 generations, 60 million babies. I am glad we have passed the legislation that protects a born-alive baby from being killed by the abortionist. I am glad we did that today, but we should not see it as a premier piece of legislation that is going to end even one abortion. Instead, it might end some of the killing post-abortion. So it says something about our defense of life, but it doesn't say nearly enough about our defense of life.

Through the time that I have been here in this pro-life movement in Iowa and here in this Congress, 2 decades more altogether, I have gone from trying to get legislation passed that required that if a young mother was

seeking an abortion—a minor mother was seeking an abortion—that she needed to have parental notification. That was about all we could get back when I started on this in 1996. Notify a parent, even then they defined the parent as, well, she can notify a mom or a dad, a stepmom or a stepdad, a grandmother or a grandfather, an aunt or an uncle, a brother or a sister in the whole or half blood.

That is how Planned Parenthood lobbied to define this parent that would be notified that this child mother was going to get an abortion. There is still not parental consent in my State, but, instead, it is parental notification with this long list of what a parent is: a father, a mother, a guardian, a legal guardian—those are okay—then grandparents, aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters in the whole or half blood.

I said: You left out the neighbor, the family cat or the family dog. Couldn't you just name everything as a parent? Maybe you could seal an envelope up and put it in a safety deposit box, and they could open up the archives in 100 years, and that would be the notice, for all the impact they had.

They did everything to restrict anything that might protect an innocent unborn baby. That is what it was like in 1996 for me in my State.

So through that time, we have marched through this march of incrementalism.

Prior to that—God bless Henry Hyde. From where I stand and from the floor of this House, time after time he stood up and he defended life. The Hyde amendment, along with the Mexico City policy, over the effect of these many years along the way, has cumulatively saved somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 million lives. Now, that sounds like a big number, 2 million lives, and it makes me feel good about Henry Hyde.

I recall going to his funeral and saying good-bye to Henry. I know that if there is anybody who has stood here and talked at the podium who is in heaven, it is Henry Hyde. The number one pro-life activist, effective worker here as a former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, he used the tools of his job and his character and his faith to save roughly 2 million lives.

Then I try to figure out: How many others did we save with the incrementalism that we have?

I was involved in the effort. I want to tip my hat to STEVE CHABOT, who was the chairman of the Constitution Committee at that time when I came to this Congress, and we had the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. That was passed out of this Congress and written into law, but they litigated that to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court came down and turned it down in a decision that said you can't ban partial-birth abortion because that procedure is written too vaguely within the law, so the physician—put that in quotes, the “physician”—can't determine exactly what is lawful and what isn't. On

top of that, we hadn't determined that a partial-birth abortion is never necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we went back to work and we rewrote that legislation to conform with the Supreme Court's “no” decision. We precisely defined the ghastly act of partial-birth abortion in law. We held multiple hearings. Through the course of that, we established congressional findings that a partial-birth abortion was never medically necessary to save the life of the mother.

So we answered both of the Supreme Court's objections, and that went back out again, where it was litigated through the three circuits that were converging before the Supreme Court. I was part of that, and I sat through one of those cases in Lincoln, Nebraska, and then came to hear the case here in the United States Supreme Court as well, and there we prevailed.

Now, I don't know how many lives we have saved with the ban on partial-birth abortion. They will find another way to abort that baby, but at least we put another principle in place. We are still stuck at about 2 million babies saved over the course of 45 years.

I look at some of the other legislation we passed out of the House but not the Senate. Senate Democrats are blocking piece after piece of legislation, but a couple of months ago we passed the legislation over to the Senate that, as we call it, Pain-Capable, or the 20-week abortion ban, and that legislation is the legislation I mentioned a few minutes ago. We have determined that a baby can feel pain. We have evidence of them squirming and struggling to get away from the surgeon's tools, and we have got the testimony of abortionists that tell us how a baby struggles and exhibits pain.

Many of you, I believe, Mr. Speaker, have seen the surgery that was being conducted on about a 7-month gestational baby. The incision went into the womb, and that baby reached outside his mother's womb and held the finger of the surgeon. That picture will be in my mind forever. We can't think that a baby that can grasp the finger of a surgeon 2 months before he is born is not a human being and not a human life. Of course they are.

So we in this House banned abortion after 20 weeks under the definition that they are capable of feeling pain. That is a step in the right direction and it is a pretty big chunk of incrementalism as well that goes further than maybe anything that has come off the floor of this House so far.

We also have legislation waiting here that has pieces of incrementalism, but the Born-Alive legislation that passed this morning here is incrementalism, and it is a small incrementalism that actually doesn't stop a single abortion, but does put a statement down on the value of that baby.

Then there is legislation here that prohibits sex-selected abortion, because we are seeing now with ultrasound that you can determine at

an early stage whether it is a boy or whether it is a girl. We have people who say: Well, I think I will abort the girl because I want my first child to be a boy. I will take my chances the next time.

How do you do that? How do you do that? If you believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms, how can you take the life of a little baby and say, “I don't want this child to be the sibling to my next child because it is a girl instead of a boy,” or, and less often, “a boy instead of a girl?”

We know what that has done statistically in China with the one-child policy in China, which they have just lifted to some degree, and you have family after family that will abort any pregnancy that is not a boy because they want a boy to carry on the name.

□ 1230

I have a former constituent named Gill Copper, now passed away. Gill Copper was one of Merrill's Marauders who fought down out of the Asian subcontinent in the Second World War. For a while, he was stationed in India, and there, under the Ganges River that goes through New Delhi, or Delhi, India, I believe that is the river—but he would go down and wait under that bridge, especially towards evening, and he would just stand in the water, say, up to here, and he would listen and watch and listen for the splash.

When he heard the splash, he knew what brought that about. The splash was, many times, a little girl baby who was being thrown off the bridge into the river because they didn't want a little girl. Gill Copper would swim out there, in that dirty river, get ahold of that little baby, bring that baby and swim back to shore with that baby, dry that baby off, get that baby breathing, and carry that baby down to the orphanage and start that baby's life there.

He saved dozens and dozens of little girl babies by posting himself in that river in India, as a warrior defending our freedom in the Second World War, and he became a pro-life activist. He already was. He came back to America a pro-life activist.

I want to do all we can to support his sacrifice in his memory, and in Henry Hyde's, and in Joe Pitts', and in CHRIS SMITH's, and in Trent Franks'. Those are the names of the people who have led on this issue since I have been in this Congress and before. All of them deserve a special place in all of our heads and hearts for the work that they have done.

We are at a place now where the pieces of legislation that have come through this House of Representatives and have been sent to the Senate, or are poised to come through this House and sent to the Senate, now it comes down in the House to this: we have the bill that prohibits sex-selected abortion. Let's see. We have no sex-selected abortion, and Pain-Capable legislation has already passed.

And then CHRIS SMITH has legislation that prohibits abortion on the dismemberment. To describe this, Mr. Speaker, is also ghastly and ghastly, and that is the process of the dismemberment abortion, where the surgeon reaches in with specially made forceps and grips a part of a baby and pulls—we had a doctor who had committed I don't know how many thousands of abortions describe this before the Judiciary Committee—and pull with very strong force, pull hard and come out with an arm or a leg or a part of a torso, and arrange those pieces in a stainless steel pan to see if he got all the pieces of the baby who he was tearing apart.

CHRIS SMITH's legislation stops that ghastly process. It doesn't end abortion, but it ends the ghastly process of dismemberment abortion, and I support that legislation. In fact, I have signed on to every piece of pro-life legislation that has come through this House of Representatives, unless I just missed one somewhere. I believe it is every single one.

But as I watched this incrementalism take place, I have always looked for, when do the stars align themselves right? How do we get to this place where we do what we know is true, and right, and just? When will it be aligned right?

And the alignment, we have known this for 45 years. We can save these lives, those who will be aborted in the future; we can save them if we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives that is willing to take action, if we have a pro-life majority in the United States Senate that can figure out how to get past the 60-vote filibuster rule, if we have a President who will sign the legislation, and if we have a Supreme Court that will uphold that legislation.

Four windows, Mr. Speaker, four windows we need to have open. And they almost have to be open, they have to be open in sequence, and they have to be open at the right time.

So, today, we have a pro-life majority in the House of Representatives ready to move, if we can get it to the floor, any reasonable piece of pro-life legislation that is consistent with the philosophy that I have articulated here in the last half hour. The House is ready.

The Senate has a pro-life majority. They don't have, yet, a way to get past that 60-vote threshold of the filibuster; except, all MITCH MCCONNELL needs to do is go out there and make a motion to amend the rule, by suspending or deleting the filibuster rule, and that can pass by a simple majority in the United States Senate. So all he needs is 51 votes. And I will bet you MIKE PENCE would fly back from the Middle East to cast that 51st vote if it meant opening up the door to save these lives and put an end to the discretion of aborting babies because they happen to be inconvenient, or for other purposes.

So the House is ready. The Senate has a pro-life majority. They have got

to get past the filibuster. The President will sign legislation to save lives; and he is giving a speech, maybe about now, talking about the value of innocent, unborn human life.

We have never had such a pro-life President. We have never had—and I will say this twice—we have never, never had such a pro-life Vice President, MIKE PENCE, who sat next to me on my elbow on the Judiciary Committee for, I believe it was, 10 years. I understand his convictions, and I know what he will be saying to the President. I understand the President's convictions.

We need to get legislation to the President's desk. What a tragedy if we failed to move when we had the chance to move. What a tragedy if we weren't bold when we had the opportunity to be bold. What a tragedy if we are stuck in the rut of incrementalism and this little, dinky war of attrition that goes on between factions here within the House and within the Senate when we know what is the true, right, and just thing to do.

But I have described how we have to be precise in the way we draft legislation that prohibits practices; it prohibits abortion, along with other things. And we have to determine the rationale for our decisions here in the House and in the Senate.

So I drafted legislation a year and a half ago, and it is called the Heartbeat Protection Act. The Heartbeat Protection Act is H.R. 490, and it does this: it directs that, if an abortionist is planning to commit an abortion, he must first check for a heartbeat. If a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is the center of the legislation. It is only a few pages. It is not complex. We stripped it down so it was clean and everybody could understand it.

We define the check for the heartbeat to be within the parameters of modern medicine. We can determine a heartbeat, we know the heart will beat as early as 18 days, but it can be determined with confidence at about 6 weeks. So the 20-week bill is the Pain-Capable. This Heartbeat bill can be thought of in, say, roughly 6 weeks from conception. But our definition is the heartbeat, not any time frame. The heartbeat is precise.

You can say then to the Supreme Court, we are not going to end the lives of these babies if their heart is beating. We can determine whether the heart is beating or not.

One hundred percent of the time that a baby's heart is beating, you have got a live baby; and so we know if we stop that beating heart, we have ended the life of a baby. It is really clear and simple, and it doesn't take a Rhodes Scholar to figure that out, even at the Supreme Court level.

It is within our hearts, and I look across the countryside, and the miles and miles, thousands and thousands of miles, that I have driven over the last 45 years, and each year, I see more and

more of the billboards up, many of them put up by the Knights of Columbus, that say, "Abortion Stops a Beating Heart," or "We All Start Small."

They have gotten into our heads and into our conscience and into the culture of America. When we see those billboards, we know what that says. It says, defend these little innocents. They might be the ones who produce the miracles going forward. Every one of them is a miracle; every one of them created in God's image.

But we know that abortion stops a beating heart, and we have all heard that rhythm of the ultrasound. We have all heard that sound of a beating heart. If the rules didn't prohibit it, I would take out my iPhone and play this into the microphone because I have got one of those glorious things that is really close to me in my iPhone right now, the beating of that little heart, 158 beats per minute, a healthy, healthy little child. I have had them sent to me by constituents. They want me to listen, and they will show me the ultrasound.

I have a district representative who framed the first ultrasound for his firstborn, and that little guy now—that frame has been in his office for all these years. That little guy now, his name is Joseph Dean Anderson, is 9 years old, and he is my godson. His first picture is of his ultrasound. It is still framed, it is still cherished by his parents, and he is cherished by me.

These lives are utterly precious. They are the future of our country. Today, we have 102 million Americans who are working, they are of working-age, simply not in the workforce.

We are hearing debates here and in the Senate going on this week and next week, and many weeks thereafter, about how we don't have a workforce in America to do the work; so we have to go to foreign countries and bring people here who bring with them a different culture, which, if they embrace ours, is fine. They will assimilate to Americanism.

But we have got a large segment of America that is coaching them not to do that, to stick with the old ways, rather than our ways. There is a consequence to that that is for another discussion, another time, Mr. Speaker.

But I will submit this: 60 million babies aborted since *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. Roughly half of them were girls. I went back through this decade by decade and did the math to calculate how many babies would those 30 million girls who would have grown by now, many of them into women, how many babies would they have had?

By my measure—and it is back-of-the-envelope only, but it is all we really need to understand the concept—another 60 million. We are not only missing 60 million babies in this country who were aborted since *Roe v. Wade*, we are missing another 60 million babies who were not born because their mothers were aborted. Now that is 120 million Americans who are missing,

and they weigh on our conscience. That is a third of our population, or 320 million Americans.

So I can say to a school auditorium, to two girls, two boys, or to a boy and a girl, I can say: You two look at each other. And they look at each other.

And then I will say: Do you know what's missing? Your classmate. Your friend would be sitting between you now if it had not been for abortion.

For every two we have, there is another one that would be sitting—every two Americans we have, there is another one that would be sitting in between that would have needed a pair of shoes and a ball glove and maybe a dance contest costume, all the little things that come from little boys and girls, all the joy and all the laughter.

Can you imagine shutting down a third of the laughter in a country? Or can you think about what America would be like if we were a country that we just stopped having babies? I mean, it is dialed down even worse in other countries, but that is where the joy and the laughter comes from.

Without babies, there is no joy. Without babies, there is no laughter. It slowly silences itself as the years go by, if we had no more babies born in America. That means the 1-year-olds would be where we get the giggles and the laughs from. They laugh and giggle for a few more years, and by the time they got into their twenties, that would diminish down some.

They don't have any children, remember. They don't have children to love; so their joy is going to be less. And as they get older, the hope would be gone because what would you be preparing for, except your own death?

But we live for the next generation, and I want that next generation, all of them, to be born. I want them to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, to play, to work, to be parents, to have children of their own, to raise those siblings, to broker the disagreements that come along with that, to develop themselves and feel how full you are when you are a person that is completely gifted by the blessings of children and grandchildren.

But that has been snuffed out by shortsightedness because of the permissibility of the Supreme Court decision in 1973, *Roe v. Wade*, and *Doe v. Bolton*. And we are here in this town today marching, marching from the Mall to the Supreme Court Building for, I guess it would be technically, the 44th time.

What did we accomplish? Some things. We supported Henry Hyde, the Hyde amendment. The Mexico City policy has saved about 2 million lives. We banned partial-birth abortion. We have passed a bill out of the House of Representatives that bans abortion after 20 weeks, when we believe that they are—and they are—pain-capable of suffering the grueling pain of abortion. We have done that.

But we sit here with the Heartbeat bill. It is the strongest, best supported

pro-life bill at this stage of it that is before the United States House of Representatives ever. Even Pain-Capable came in to the announcement that there would be a floor vote on it with about 151 or 153 signatures on it.

□ 1245

The Heartbeat bill—which requires the abortionist to check for a beating heart, and if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected—has today 170 cosponsors on it. It has another good, long list of people who say: I am not ready to sign on, but if you put it on the floor, I will vote for it.

We can pass that bill off the House of Representatives and send it over to the Senate. And if there are those who think, “Well, we don't want to let the Heartbeat bill get ahead of the Pain-Capable bill,” I don't know why we wouldn't do that. I think that is a better policy, actually, and anybody who wants to save lives ought to be for that. But if that is their decision, fine. The Heartbeat bill can push the Pain-Capable bill out onto the floor of the Senate and there can be a debate and a vote on Pain-Capable, the 20-week bill, in the Senate.

But there is no debate going on over there today. They don't have pro-life legislation moving through the United States Senate today. It is blocked up and balled up because they have a filibuster rule, and they are a little preoccupied, by the way. But if all this United States Congress can do on March for Life day is to bring a bill that deals with post-abortion, born-alive, saving those babies, I am glad we did it. We should have done another bill. We should have done the Heartbeat bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances are this. The whip team for the Heartbeat bill deserves a lot of credit. Janet Porter, Faith2Action, deserves a lot of credit. She is a driving force on this, Mr. Speaker.

Our former whip and majority leader, Tom DeLay from Texas, has been working pro bono on this case for a long time, for a good year. He has been strategizing on that. He has been pulling votes together on it. His greatest regret as a now-retired majority leader in the United States House of Representatives is that he wasn't able to end abortion while he was the leader here in this Congress.

And his word to our leadership here and to all of us is: Don't let this opportunity get away from you. This is the best opportunity. This is the best scenario. The window is open with a pro-life majority in the House and it is open with a pro-life majority in the Senate. The President will sign the bill, and the Vice President will stand next to him, feeling good about it.

By the way, the Vice President and his wife, Karen, will probably hold hands and offer a prayer right before an act like that would happen.

And the Supreme Court is poised for one or two more appointments to that

Supreme Court; and those appointments being, I expect, consistent with President Trump's pledge that he will make those nominations out of the list that was produced by The Federalist Society and confirmed and supported by The Heritage Foundation and by me, by the way, and many other pro-life activists within this Congress and across this country. The selection that President Trump made out of those 21 potential Justices to the Supreme Court was excellent.

Neil Gorsuch, there is no better choice, in my view. And one of the things that I think is important that goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is some, I will say, very solidly confirmed back-channel information is this: that the White House interviewed all 20 or 21 of those candidates for the Supreme Court. Out of those, they asked the same question of each one of them. And it was this, Mr. Speaker: If it is not going to be you as the nominee to the Supreme Court, who shall it be?

Every other candidate, every other Judge under consideration for appointment to become a Supreme Court Justice, said: If it is not to be me, it needs to be Neil Gorsuch.

You could not get a higher endorsement on such a high-level position than that, that all of your peers that were in the running said: If it is not to be me, it needs to be Neil Gorsuch.

We are going to be very happy with his process and his decisions that he makes for us, and I have a lot of reasons to have great confidence in him. But I offer that for consideration, Mr. Speaker.

But our job here needs to be all we can do. When the window is open, we have got to go through that window. The window is open to pass the Heartbeat bill now. 170 cosponsors. We have 129 national organizations and leaders that support the Heartbeat bill. It is about as close to unanimous across the entire movement in this country as it could possibly be.

So with 170 cosponsors and another high number of those who say, “I will vote for it, put it on the floor,” the vast majority of the Pro-Life Caucus wants it to come to the floor, the vast majority of the Values Action Team wants it to come to the floor. I actually don't know who the dissenters are here in the House that say it is a bad idea to have the Heartbeat bill in law.

There are a couple of people who disagree with the strategy, but they don't disagree with the policy, at least on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker.

So when the leadership tells the top pro-life organizations in the country, “You must be unanimous in this and be on the same page,” and when one organization says, “I don't want to see this moved,” then we have a problem. We have a problem because the will of the people needs to be reflected here in the House of Representatives.

This is a republican form of government by constitution. The Constitution guarantees a republican form of

government, which means a representative form of government. That is, each one of us who have been elected here has a district of about 750,000 people, and it is our job to draw from them their best ideas and couple them with the principles that we have said we stand for, come here and bring those ideas into the House of Representatives, and then let those ideas, out of 435 congressional districts, compete against each other so that the best ideas rise to the top.

The ideas that rise to the top need to be the ideas that have the most support, not something that was pulled off the shelf and dropped in down here in a bit of a token for something to do here on March for Life day.

What is the most important thing we can be doing?

Saving innocent, unborn human life.

What is the highest priority we should have—the highest priority for the Members of the House of Representatives? What pro-life bill has the most cosponsors on it by far?

That is the Heartbeat bill.

So why wasn't it on the floor here today, Mr. Speaker? Why not?

The reason is because I believe that there was—shall I call it—an arrangement made by a previous Speaker that pro-life legislation only moves when it is unanimously supported by the top three pro-life organizations in the country.

I will name them. I count them all as people who have done a lot of good for this country.

Family Research Council, led by Tony Perkins, who is a tremendous pro-life, pro-family warrior. And that is also true, we know, because his office has been targeted in the past and they face violence down there in the entryway to his office. Tony doesn't blink. He is a former marine. We have ridden the road together and been out there in those battles. They are a strong, strong pro-life organization, one of the top three.

Susan B. Anthony List, another one of the top three. That is led by Marjorie Dannenfelser, who has a terrific heart, who is very driven and awfully intelligent, and who has a terrific memory about the components of the movement that have gone on.

Her sidekick—I will call her that—is an even closer friend, Marilyn Musgrave, who I served here in the House of Representatives with for a good number of years, and she was a mentor to me, and she braced me up sometimes when I was trying to make sense of things that didn't make sense.

Mr. Speaker, I count them as friends and pro-life warriors, terrific workers, and people who are go-to people who I count on keeping things on the rails while I am distracted with other things. But we are always on the same page together. Almost always on the same page together, Mr. Speaker.

The other organization is National Right to Life. National Right to Life has been granted also a de facto veto

power, which the effect of it is to block a bill from coming to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Now, I have said there are 129 organizations and leaders that have endorsed and/or support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. There is only one that does not, and that is the National Right to Life, and that is led by Carol Tobias and David O'Steen. And I have spoken with both of them at great length, not in person. I have been trying to get those kinds of meetings. But I spoke on the phone with Carol Tobias, the president, a week or so before our Christmas break, about 45 minutes of intense discussion. And throughout all of that, she has insisted that they are not going to endorse the bill, they are not going to promote the bill. I couldn't get her to move one inch, even though every other organization is on board. I couldn't get her to move one inch.

She told me that they had had a board meeting, sounded to me like a couple months earlier, and that nobody on the board supported the Heartbeat bill.

How big is that board?

This is back channel. I am told about 50.

Can you imagine 50 pro-life activists sitting on the board of National Right to Life and not one of them thinks that protecting a baby that has a detectable heartbeat is an endeavor that they want to support right now when their mission statement says something entirely different?

Well, that didn't seem right to me, and I hoped there was another way to get this resolved, so I told her at the end of the conversation: I guess we have got a couple weeks before the tension starts to build, but I don't have many nice things I can do yet, and I don't think your advice is going to be, to me, to just give up and put the Heartbeat bill in a drawer and say: H.R. 490 was a nice try, but we came up short so I guess it wasn't a good idea.

How would I go to those 129 organizations and leaders and say to them, "Well, I think we will just give up now because National Right to Life is not supporting our bill because Carol Tobias and 50 members of the board, presumably, and also David O'Steen, don't think it is a good idea to move the Heartbeat bill out of the House of Representatives, that they want to wait until the Supreme Court is ready to receive such a bill, apparently without calculating that it takes time to get legislation through the House and the Senate and to the President's desk"?

And it may not happen this year if we put the Heartbeat bill on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk in the Senate. It may not happen that the bill would even be taken up. We have got to have time to bring that bill to the floor of the Senate. We are going to have to work on it. I want time to do that.

The longer we stall, the closer we get to the next election. If we get to the next election and lose seats in the

House of Representatives, Mr. Speaker, this window in the House could close, and then what do they say? They will say: Well, it was our judgment. We wanted to wait until the Supreme Court was ready. It wasn't our fault that the window closed in the House or the Senate, or perhaps the Presidency.

When you have the opportunity to move the agenda, you move the agenda. We have the opportunity to do that. And it is de facto veto power right now that the National Right to Life has because of that arrangement that was put together some years ago that says these top three pro-life organizations have to all be in agreement before we are going to move any legislation off the floor of the House.

Why would any Speaker grant de facto authority to an outside organization, none of whom have been elected in this republican form of government? Why would that be allowed to trump the will of the people? Why would that have more value than the considered judgment of the vast majority of the Republican Conference in the House of Representatives? How can we say to any one of those 170: Your opinion doesn't matter at all because you don't yet have the unanimous enthusiasm of the top three pro-life organizations in the country?

It comes back to National Right to Life. They put out a statement that says: We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. We do not oppose the Heartbeat bill. The other side of that coin is, and it is the same coin: We do not support the Heartbeat bill. That is the message.

That is the message that Speaker RYAN gets, and that is why this bill wasn't on the floor today. It is the blockage that comes from inactivity. And all that needs to happen is David O'Steen or Carol Tobias needs to pick up the phone, call Speaker PAUL RYAN—call my office if you like, and I will patch you through—and say: Do you know what? We want to move it while we have got the chance.

The window is open in the House of Representatives. You don't have to do a single thing beyond that. You don't have to whip the bill. You don't have to go visit any Members. You don't have to spend a single dime of those hard-earned dollars that are being raised in the pro-life movement except for the cost of the phone call, and I will pay for it.

Call the Speaker. Call Leader MCCARTHY and say: Do you know what? We do think it is a good idea.

Instead of saying: We do not oppose, when really it is you do not support, all you have to do is say: Let that bill go.

Just like Charlton Heston as Moses, let our people go. Let those little babies with heartbeats live. Get a bill out of the House to the Senate, and then let's turn the pressure up in the Senate. It isn't going to happen unless we take the first step like a little baby that is wobbling and tottering. They

learn to walk. They need a chance to get that chance to walk.

□ 1300

We need to be able to move the bill off the floor of the House of Representatives. This isn't a stretch for public opinion. The public opinion is with us. In fact, the polling has been a little higher in support for H.R. 490, the Heartbeat bill. It is even a little higher than it is on the 20-week Pain-Capable one, which has been out there. They have been working on it for years, and I respect that and appreciate it.

But there isn't some kind of a rule that says you have to struggle for years before your bill can be heard. The strongest and best ideas that have weathered the debate need to come forward and be moved off the floor of the House of Representatives.

Here is what it is: 170 Members signed on; 129 organizations or leaders support the bill. I don't know why one group has veto power, de facto veto authority over this bill. We need a vote on the Heartbeat bill, and it is now being blocked because of that inaction. One phone call, or, if they just wanted to post it on their website, instead of "we do not oppose the Heartbeat bill," just post on there "we now support the Heartbeat bill." God bless them if they will do that, because things will move.

Now, this Heartbeat bill is the most popular pro-life bill that is pending in the House of Representatives today, and it has been for a long time, for almost this whole Congress. It prevents about 95 percent of the abortions. And this does push the Senate. It pushes Pain-Capable off of MITCH MCCONNELL's desk and perhaps to the floor of the Senate for a vote. It moves the agenda. It helps the other pieces of legislation as well.

Here is a polling, though, Mr. Speaker, that I think should give people some confidence; and that is that, all in all, across the spectrum of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans, the Heartbeat bill, as written, has 69 percent of adults all the way across the spectrum.

This is a Barna poll that took place last year—not that long ago—and here is how it breaks down by party, in case people are worried about that: 86 percent of Republicans support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490; 55 percent of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490. A majority of Democrats support the Heartbeat bill, 55 percent, and 61 percent of Independents.

When you put that all together and you match it up for the demographics—so the percentages that are Democrats versus Independents and Republicans—and you merge that together, 69 percent support the Heartbeat bill. That is a little better than the 20-week Pain-Capable bill. People understand this.

That beating heart is in our hearts, and so are these little babies. And I would say to National Right to Life, whose mission statement almost commands them to support the Heartbeat

bill, you ought to amend your mission statement or support the Heartbeat bill.

Here is one of their founders, a founder of the pro-life movement and the founder and former president of National Right to Life—now passed away, sadly—and he surely did his part, Dr. John C. Willke. Here is what he had to say:

"When I founded the pro-life movement, it wasn't to regulate how abortions would be done; it was to bring the abortion killing to an end. We have waited too long, and that wait has cost us too much"—Dr. John C. Willke.

Take this back to 1973. The missions there were to end abortion. And yet we are stuck in a rut of incrementalism, moving a tiny little bit at a time. We saved 2 million lives in all of this—maybe a few more than 2 million lives, no more—and we watched 60 million babies be aborted. And I am hearing the argument of, well, we really can't move because the Supreme Court is not ready, and we don't know if there are going to be any retirements in the Supreme Court.

I know there will be retirements in the Supreme Court. I am certain of it. There will be that. There are three ways out of the Supreme Court, and those folks who were there 100 years ago aren't there now. So we know there is going to be a change in the Court. What we don't know is this Court may well uphold Heartbeat because it is more precisely written and more carefully drafted, and it answers the right kind of questions. I think it has a better chance of being upheld before the Supreme Court than Pain-Capable.

But those who pushed Pain-Capable, 20-week didn't have those reservations on their bill, but they seem to wonder about this one and say we shouldn't move Heartbeat until we have another appointment to the Supreme Court.

How can you let that happen? Well, perhaps the window closes in the House or the Senate or Presidency. Sitting here twiddling our thumbs and watching babies be aborted at a rate of—oh, by the way, I did get this piece from National Right to Life in a conversation just yesterday that, when they began this effort, there were as many as 6 million abortions a year in America—I hadn't heard that number before, and I didn't go back to verify it, but that is what my ears heard yesterday—and we have now gotten that number down to under 1 million abortions a year. That is considered progress, and it is progress.

Then he gave me the exact number 900-and-some thousand abortions last year. I didn't commit that number to memory, but it means something different to me. That is 1 million abortions a year, every year. That means, in 45 years, we will have another 45 million abortions on our conscience. And that 60 million abortions for today turns into 105 million abortions if we just double the time span from *Roe v. Wade* another 45 years.

And to take pride in getting it down to less than 1 million, as if that is a milestone, troubles me considerably. It might not have if I had just only heard it in that context, but I heard it in a different context 4 or 5 months ago, standing over here on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

There is a gentlewoman from the Democratic Party who is one who—really, there are only a couple of pro-life people over here anymore, so you know that she is not pro-life. She asked me why I have this heart on my lapel, and I told her it was for the Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490, and I want to protect these babies. From the moment a heartbeat can be detected, the baby must be protected. And she said: I don't know why you want to do that, STEVE. We have got abortions down to under 1 million a year.

I said: I want to save them all. I want to save every single one of them. That is why I am going to wear this on my lapel until we get this job done.

But it was stunning to me that she would say that, being a pro-choice Representative here in the United States House of Representatives. And when I match that up with almost the same thing from a leader in the National Right to Life, I think: We have got to take a fresh look. They are too stuck in their ways. We will never get to the end of abortion if we are married to tiny incrementalism. We have an obligation to take the opportunities that God has given us and the voters have given us and act on them.

I would go to personhood, the moment of conception, and do that in an instant if we could get that done, but we can't define medically and precisely that moment of conception. But we have defined medically and precisely the heartbeat. That is our marker, the heartbeat in that ultrasound.

We had a little witness come before the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee, which I chair. We held a hearing on the Heartbeat bill. And this little guy was the youngest witness to testify in the history of the United States Congress, I believe. He is an 18-week developed little boy in his mother's womb. And we had the ultrasound sitting next to his mother, but the tape of the ultrasound that they had taken hours before.

This little boy's name is Lincoln Glenn Miller. And that little guy, we showed his ultrasound and we showed him there in his mother's womb, and we listened to his heartbeat. His arm was out like this. And I said into the microphone, "Lincoln, will you move your arm?" and, in an instant, he jerked his arm toward his mouth. And I said, "Lincoln, can you suck your thumb?" and, in a moment, he put his thumb in his mouth and began to suck his thumb.

And I said, a little bit later, "Lincoln, can you talk to us?" and you can see his mouth moving as if he is trying to talk in this ultrasound on the big screen in the United States Congress in

the House Judiciary Committee, the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee. We watched this little guy, Lincoln Glenn Miller, testify to the humanity of an 18-week developed little child.

We know this life begins at the moment of conception. We know that we can precisely define that heartbeat. We know that, if you have to check for that heartbeat, it is awfully hard to lie about it when you have to keep the records. We know that it has gotten into our conscience that abortion stops a beating heart, and we all, in our mind's ear, can hear that rhythm of that beating heart.

I used 158 beats per minute. That is what is in my iPhone right now. And I can listen to that little baby as that little baby grows and develops. I want to see all of these babies grow and develop. I want to see every one of them come to birth and full term. I pray that they are mentally healthy and that they are physically healthy, and I don't have any more asks after that.

Boys or girls, God, bring them to me in whatever order they might come, but let's get them born and let's take care of them and nurture them in mind, in body, and in faith, as our Founding Fathers envisioned when they wrote the language into our Declaration of Independence and prioritized life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

God bless them. Let's do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0101

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for Friday, January 19, 2018, after 6 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of family illness.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 17, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 984. To extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

H.R. 4641. To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Saturday, January 20, 2018, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LATTI, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 4844. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4845. A bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission and communications service providers regulated by the Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 shall not be subject to certain provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the National Historic Preservation Act with respect to the construction, rebuilding, or hardening of communications facilities following a major disaster or an emergency declared by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 4846. A bill to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4847. A bill to streamline the process for consideration of applications for the placement of communications facilities on certain Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for

discretionary appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4849. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 4850. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to alter the deadlines by which an application for asylum must be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 4851. A bill to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic Site in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. FASO, Mr. YODER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 4852. A bill to make continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a shutdown of the Federal Government, to reduce the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which such a shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana):

H.R. 4853. A bill to require FERC to examine certain hydropower licenses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RATLIFF):

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide additional resources to State and local prosecutors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. POCAN, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide an incentive for households participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program to purchase certain nutritious fruits and vegetables that are beneficial to good health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs.

BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 4856. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to obtain a statue of Shirley Chisholm for placement in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the requirements for secure geological storage of carbon dioxide for purposes of the carbon dioxide sequestration credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 4858. A bill to clarify section 224 of the Communications Act of 1934 as not limiting the ability of a State to adopt a one touch make ready policy for pole attachments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 4859. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow certain payments made by public service employees to qualify for public service repayment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4860. A bill to relocate the headquarters of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 4861. A bill to nullify certain guidance on deposit advance products, to require the Federal banking agencies to establish standards for short-term, small-dollar loans made by insured depository institutions, to exempt insured depository institutions and insured credit unions from the payday lending rule of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 4862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow section 529 education accounts to be used for homeschooling expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 4863. A bill to establish a competitive bidding process for the relocation of the headquarters of Executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addi-

tion to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize unlawful flight to avoid prosecution into or from Indian country; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to establish a conservation practice-based pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4866. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under the Medicaid Program to 80 percent; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4867. A bill to clarify the definitions of certain terms relating to marriage under Federal law to prevent child marriages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 4868. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Pillow Historic State Park in Henning, Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4869. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 4870. A bill to prohibit the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.J. Res. 126. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures with respect to Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.J. Res. 127. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for military pay and for death gratuities and related survivor benefits for survivors of deceased military service members of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLUM (for himself, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BARTON, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Czechoslovakia, the 25th anniversary of the independence of the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, and reaffirming the bonds of friendship and cooperation between the United States and the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H. Res. 705. A resolution impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. MOULTON):

H. Res. 706. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Women's Health Research Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H. Res. 707. A resolution recognizing the growth and transformation of the Republic of Korea and its significant contributions to the international community; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 4844.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment V, Section 1—the "Due Process" clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 4847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4848.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7, "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "Congress shall have the power . . . [t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 4849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 4850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:
H.R. 4852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BABIN:
H.R. 4853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:
H.R. 4854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:
H.R. 4855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 2
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:
H.R. 4856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Mr. CRAMER:
H.R. 4857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:
H.R. 4858.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FOSTER:
H.R. 4859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:
H.R. 4860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress Under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 4861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 4862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 4863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power . . . Clause 17: To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful Buildings;

And
Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. NOEM:
H.R. 4864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NOLAN:
H.R. 4865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8
By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 4866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clauses 1, 17 and 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 1: "Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof."

By Mr. RUSH:
H.R. 4868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United, States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 4869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 4, 18 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

By Mr. YARMUTH:
H.J. Res. 126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:
H.J. Res. 127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 12 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 169: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 291: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 398: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 457: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 564: Ms. HANABUSA.

H.R. 630: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 719: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 731: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 807: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 820: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 850: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 858: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 911: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1149: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HECK and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1267: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1437: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1444: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1495: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1519: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1536: Mr. BERA, Mr. KIND, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. FASO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 1563: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 1596: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1606: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1683: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1789: Mr. WELCH, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1794: Mr. KIND, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1928: Mr. BEYER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CRIST, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1957: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1970: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2002: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 2044: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 2143: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2166: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2215: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 2220: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. FASO, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2252: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 2273: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MASSIE, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 2319: Mr. MARINO.
 H.R. 2472: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. HINES.
 H.R. 2501: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 2561: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 2640: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2644: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 2652: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 2723: Mr. BERGMAN.
 H.R. 2740: Mr. BERA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2838: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2839: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 2933: Mr. GALLEGO.
 H.R. 2976: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2996: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 3222: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 3252: Mr. GOMEZ.
 H.R. 3272: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. BARR, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3286: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3495: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3566: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 3598: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3654: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3761: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3964: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 4044: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 4096: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 4099: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. DONOVAN.
 H.R. 4107: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
 H.R. 4131: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 4139: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4143: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 4253: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 4265: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4271: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 4306: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4345: Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4392: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4396: Ms. MENG and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 4465: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 4480: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 4506: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 4525: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 4526: Mr. MESSER.
 H.R. 4547: Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 4548: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4549: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
 H.R. 4575: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 4671: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 4677: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 4691: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4693: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4699: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 4736: Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 4743: Mr. MARSHALL, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 4744: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MAST, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 4760: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BACON, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 4776: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4777: Mr. SOTO and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 4780: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 4782: Mrs. DEMINGS and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 4783: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 4810: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 4820: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 4821: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 4822: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS,

Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. LOESACK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4827: Ms. LEE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POSTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VELA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 4828: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4831: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 4837: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4840: Mr. SOTO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Con. Res. 63: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 188: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 201: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 245: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 271: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 274: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 349: Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Res. 466: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 564: Mr. BIGGS.

H. Res. 644: Ms. TITUS.

H. Res. 661: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 673: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 697: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Ms. SPEIER.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 2018

No. 12

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Spirit of the living God, fall afresh on us. As the clock ticks toward another deadline, inspire our lawmakers to be instruments of Your purposes. May they humbly seek to do what is best for our Nation and world, achieving together what cannot be done without allies.

Lord, give them the wisdom to see that there is a practical morality based on absolutes that they should follow. Remind them that they are accountable to You for their thoughts, words, and deeds. May they speak truth as You give them the ability to comprehend it, finding workable solutions to challenging problems.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The majority leader is recognized.

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the deadline to fund the government is nearly upon us. The Senate is now just hours away from an entirely avoidable government shutdown. At midnight tonight, funding for programs that mil-

lions of Americans rely on—veterans services, opioid treatment centers, death benefits for the families of fallen soldiers, and health insurance for 9 million vulnerable children—would be thrown into chaos.

Last night the Senate began consideration of a bill passed by the House that would erase all of these threats. The bill keeps the Federal Government open. It extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, which provides coverage for 9 million children and low-income families for 6 years. This vote should be a no-brainer, and it would be, except that the Democratic leader has convinced his Members to filibuster any funding bill that doesn't include legislation they are demanding for people who came into the United States illegally. What has been shoehorned into this discussion is an insistence that we deal with an illegal immigration issue.

He has insisted that he will not support any legislation at all for the American people no matter how non-controversial or how bipartisan unless we pass a bill on illegal immigration first. If that means shutting down the funding for veterans, military families, opioid treatment centers, and even Federal grants to his home State of New York, so be it. If it means throwing a wrench into the gears of the U.S. economy, just as Americans are starting to feel the benefits of historic tax reform, so be it. If it means failing to renew the Children's Health Insurance Program, which the House-passed bill funded for a full 6 years, apparently that is just fine with those on the other side.

Nearly every Democrat in the House made the same demand. That has been their stated position: Nothing for hundreds of millions of Americans and no healthcare for 9 million vulnerable children until we solve a non-imminent issue related to illegal immigration. To even repeat this position out loud is to see how completely ridiculous it is.

Now that we are 13 hours away from a government shutdown that the Democrats would initiate and Democrats would own, the craziness of this seems to be dawning on my friend the Democratic leader. Perhaps he is remembering his own words from 2013. Here is what he said back then about threatening a government shutdown.

No matter how strongly one feels about an issue, you shouldn't hold millions of people hostage . . . that's wrong.

A few days later, the Democratic leader added:

It's sort of like this. Someone goes into your house, takes your wife and children hostage, and then says, "Let's negotiate over the price of your house."

He went on to say.

We're shutting down the government, we're not gonna raise the debt ceiling until you pass immigration reform. It would be governmental chaos.

Now maybe he is remembering those words today because now he is saying: Never mind, I really didn't mean it, and he himself is calling for an even shorter short-term funding bill. Of course, his last-ditch proposals would do nothing for the Children's Health Insurance Program or the 9 million children who are waiting on us to renew it. What is more, the incredibly short-term continuing resolutions he is now proposing do not meet any of the demands—none of them—that he and his own conference and Democrats in the House have been making for weeks. None of that would be solved in a short-term CR—the stuff they have been calling for.

So apparently now he wants his Members to default on their own demands. He has spent days apparently persuading all of his colleagues to insist that we cannot pass another continuing resolution. Now he wants them to pass one. He spent weeks getting his Members to proclaim that we should not do anything to fund the government unless we address the DACA issue, and now apparently he is calling

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S315

on them to do just that. These incredibly short-term extensions would not even give us enough time to actually write the legislation the Democratic leader is demanding. One extremely short-term CR would lead to another and another—exactly the outcome Democrats have declared they cannot accept.

Now, I wish for all of our sakes that the Democratic leader would figure out what he actually wants. I feel bad for his own Members. He has painted them into a corner, but I especially feel bad for the American people whose government the Democrats are threatening to shut down and the 9 million children whose health insurance could be thrown into jeopardy because Senate Democrats cannot get their story straight.

Now, my friend the Democratic leader now wants his Members to pass a bill that allows SCHIP to expire. Apparently, he now wants every Democrat in the House of Representatives to break their word and pass a separate funding bill of his own that does not address the illegal immigration issue they said they must have. So let's think about this for a minute. First, he leads his own troops into a box canyon, and then tells them it was really all for nothing. Maybe it is time to come back to reality.

We already have a bill that we know can pass the House because it already did. We have a bill that we know the President will sign into law because he has already committed to do just that. We know that with one noncontroversial and bipartisan vote we can keep the government up and running. We can fund the children's healthcare program for 6 years, and we can give ourselves the time we need to finish ongoing negotiations on DACA, border security, and the long-term needs of our military. We could do all of that today—all of it—or our Democratic friends can continue to take the Democratic leader's advice and vote to shut down the government, destabilize funding for our troops, shut down the children's healthcare program, and still not get what they are demanding on illegal immigration. It is really up to them.

I look forward to voting soon on cloture on the House bill. The American people, the citizens who actually elected us, will be watching. They will see which Senators make the patriotic decision to stand up for the American people and vote to continue government funding and extend children's healthcare while we continue our bipartisan talks, and they will see which Senators vote to shove aside veterans, military families, and vulnerable children and to hold the entire country hostage until we pass an immigration bill they haven't even written yet.

It is completely unfair and uncompassionate for my Democratic colleagues to filibuster government funding, harm our troops, and jeopardize health coverage for 9 million

children because extreme elements of their base want illegal immigration to crowd out every other priority. Apparently, they believe the issue of illegal immigration is more important than everything else—all the government services the American people depend on.

I would recommend to stop the wild-goose chase. Don't go to a destination that cannot be explained. Let's fulfill the core responsibilities of Congress. Let's fund the government, provide for the American people, and then resume serious negotiations on the issues that matter most. Let's fund the government for a full month so we can actually get something done.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 195, a bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 1903 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1904 (to amendment No. 1903), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 1905, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 1905), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 1907 (to amendment No. 1906), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let's look at the reality of what we face at this moment in this country in this Chamber. The Republicans are in majority control of the Senate. The Republicans are in majority control of the House of Representatives. The Republicans are in control of the White

House. The Republicans, through their appointees, have a pretty decisive edge when it comes to the U.S. Supreme Court. In other words, when you look across the spectrum of the three branches of government, the Republicans are in control.

What are they offering us? The fourth CR. Now, CR is Washington talk. It is a continuing resolution. What does it mean? It means that the Republican majority has failed in 119 days to produce a budget for the United States of America. The Republican majority in the House and Senate—with their President—has failed to come up with a blueprint for spending for this great Nation that we serve and are proud to be part of.

Their fourth failure to produce a budget in this fiscal year, which began October 1, is before us now. Was it negotiated between the Republicans and Democrats? No. It was produced in the House of Representatives and with the Senate. It was passed there by the Republicans and a handful of Democrats who supported it, and it was sent over here on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Well, you say, at least we are going to keep the lights on. And that is all a continuing resolution does—keeps the lights on. It doesn't allow agencies to make important decisions that invest taxpayers' dollars wisely and save taxpayers' dollars.

Last night, the Department of Defense reported to us. They are sick and tired of the continuing resolutions that they have faced for 3 years—note that I said 3 years—because we have failed, even on the Democratic side, to come up with appropriations and budgets in the past. So I am being very honest about it.

If we are going to change this mentality of never producing a budget, never producing appropriations bills—kind of stumbling into the fiscal year for month after weary month—if that is the new norm around here, shame on us. And shame on the majority party, the Republicans, for saying that is the best they can do. We can do better.

We need to get beyond this world of continuing resolutions, and we need to get into a world where we actually make a decision that is good for the taxpayers, as well as the security of the United States of America. The best the Republican leader in the Senate can offer us is another bandaid, another 4 weeks of temporary funding—a wasteful gesture, a wasteful exercise, and he knows it.

There is more to this issue. Senator MCCONNELL brings it up regularly. Last night he did and again today. He glories in saying that this is all about illegal immigrants. Let's be honest about what we are talking about here. We are talking about those who were protected and allowed to live in the United States legally under an Executive order of President Obama's until September 5 of last year when President

Donald Trump announced he was eliminating this program. As that protection is eliminated, as their 2-year protection expires, yes, they move into illegal categories. So are they illegal technically after they have lost DACA? Yes. What caused it? President Donald Trump caused it by his announcement on September 5 that this program is finished by March 5. That is the reality.

Do you know what he also told us? I am going to end this program. Now I challenge you in Congress to pass a law to replace it.

So what has the Republican majority in the House and Senate done in the 4½ months since we received that challenge from President Trump? Nothing.

Then I hear Senator MCCONNELL say: We haven't even seen a written proposal from the Democrats on this.

The Senator knows better. A group of us—six of us, three Democrats and three Republicans—accepted President Trump's challenge and produced a bipartisan solution. We have described it to everyone, Democrat and Republican alike. It was a good-faith effort, real compromise and pain on both sides. It is ready. It is ready to be brought to the floor of the Senate. It is ready to be passed into law. For Senator MCCONNELL to say he doesn't know anything about it—I am sorry, but we have been very open about what is included in there. He knows it is a product of long and hard bipartisan work.

I would like to address another aspect of what he has said about these so-called illegal immigrants. Late last night, after using that term, I noticed the Gallery was filled over here with young people who appeared to be, at first glance, here to watch the debate on the Dream Act, the debate on DACA. After the meeting of the Senate, I invited them into my office. There were about 40 of them. They are from all across the United States but primarily from the State of Oregon. They came all the way out here to try to see if this Senate was going to meet President Trump's challenge and produce an alternative. It turns out that most of them were protected by DACA, the Executive order that is being abolished by President Trump.

One of them said to me: I am skipping my first week of classes at the University of Texas.

I said: What is your major?

She said: Neuroscience.

I said: Don't skip too many classes.

That has to be a tough thing to do, but she came here because what is at stake in this Chamber, what is at stake in this debate, will decide whether she can continue to live in the United States of America.

For Senator MCCONNELL to dismiss this issue and say that we will get around to it later is to ignore the obvious. For many of these young people, this debate, this moment, may decide their future. It may decide the future of their families. Are they worried? To say the least—half of them were crying as they came into my office.

At a point when I was talking to them, I said: We are going to do everything we can to help your parents.

They all broke down crying. That is what this is about. This is about a heart-wrenching issue that is before us because President Trump made a decision on September 5 to end a program that allowed these young people to go to school and to work in the United States of America. It was President Trump who challenged us to do something about it, and we have done nothing—nothing. And that is the challenge we face. To say we are in no hurry—well, we may not be as Senators and Congressmen, but these young people are in a hurry to find out whether they have a life. That is what it comes down to.

There was an announcement just a few minutes ago from the House side. The Republican leadership in the House of Representatives—despite the fact that we do not have an agreement moving forward—is going to leave. They are going to leave Washington. I don't know for how long, and I don't know what they are going to do when they leave, but I would beg them: Don't turn your backs on your responsibility right here in Washington to work with us, to find a way to move forward.

We have come up with a proposal. It is a short-term, last-step continuing resolution of just a few days. I have been around here for a while. If you give the Senate and House a couple of weeks, it turns into a couple of months. If we do this in a matter of 3 or 4 days to reach an agreement on these key issues—everything included in the CR that we have before us and everything that should be—I think we will roll up our sleeves, get down to work, and do it. We don't want to shut down this government. We want to solve the problems facing this government and this Nation. That means working together—something Senator MCCONNELL is not engaged in when it comes to this CR.

It is time for us as Democrats and Republicans to sit down in a room together and think about this great Nation and the frustration they have with our political system and those of us in political life. Nine out of ten—maybe even more—would say to us: For goodness' sake, will you stop your fighting? Will you stop your bickering? Will you stop your debating? Will you go into a room and act like grownups and do something together for the good of this Nation?

That is what we are proposing—to sit down together for the good of this Nation and to move forward.

When he was asked just a few days ago, Senator MCCONNELL said his biggest problem was that he didn't know what President Trump wants. I can understand that. I have been in meetings with the President where he said one thing on a Tuesday and a different thing on a Thursday, and then he tweeted something entirely different the next morning. He is a moving tar-

get when it comes to the policies and direction and leadership of this administration. We need to do our job, and I hope he will be part of it. I hope the President will join us. If he will, we can solve this problem. If he stands on the sidelines, we cannot.

I think we can find common ground. That is what the American people expect. We should give them nothing less. And of course we should solve the problems involving the Children's Health Insurance Program, community clinics, helping our veterans, the opioid crisis, defense spending, and a sane approach, a reasonable approach when it comes to these young people who have become illegal because of the decision by President Trump on September 5 of last year.

Together, we can get this done but not if the House Republicans leave town. We need to continue to be here in Washington doing our job and making sure that we spend every waking moment serving the people who elected us.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I listened to the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The Democrats never do anything wrong, do they? They are always right. I have to tell you, they do a lot of things that are wrong, and they are not always right. And this is a situation where they have literally pushed everybody in this country into the corner. Republicans want to do DACA. They want to take care of these young people. They have even interfered with that. I could go on and on.

All I can say is, I get a little sick of hearing some of these arguments that are made like they are holier than thou. They are not holier than thou; they are more political than thou.

I think it is time that we work together and get some things done here that make a difference in people's lives and especially in these young DACA kids' lives. We can do that, but we can't do it by just Democrats saying: Well, we are just going to give them everything they want. We are not going to worry about U.S. laws or immigration laws or anything else, for that matter.

It is incredible to me. I have put up with this all these years in the Senate, and they get away with it because the media in this country is primarily focused on them and basically supports them. And they admit it. That is the thing that is really mind-boggling—the media admits it. And the reason they do is because they know they would be laughed out of town if they didn't admit it.

All I can say is, we have a desire to resolve these problems in a reasonable and good manner. The majority leader has indicated that time after time. Politics always takes preference with our friends on the other side. They are good at it. They are really good at it, even though, if you really look at the

facts and you look behind what they are saying, it is a lot of bunk. Not all—I have worked with really top-notch Democrats in this body to do some of the most important legislation in this country's history when they were willing to sit down and really work with you. But politics rears its ugly head almost every time in such a way that it is almost impossible to get anything done around here. I have to admit, we have some on our side who fit that mode, as well.

I just wish we could do a better job. There are some of us who would do a better job if we knew that there was a way of bringing both sides together.

Having said that, we are now just a few hours away from a government shutdown, unless, of course, enough Senators can find a way to come together in order to avert it. Unfortunately, it appears that our Democratic colleagues would prefer a shutdown to compromise. The Democrats have activists and pundits cheering for that result. They have their Members in line to vote against the alternative. They have set the stage for a grand demonstration of their commitment.

But for the life of me, I can't see what they are committed to with this latest gesture to their political base. First of all, most of them don't object to the substance of the House-passed continuing resolution. That bill would keep the government open and address a number of bipartisan healthcare priorities. I don't know any Democrats who are against those. I am sure there may be some, but the rest of them, I think, are pretty much for it.

The bill before us includes what would be the longest extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program in history. CHIP has given children and their families access to quality healthcare. Maybe I have a right to speak on CHIP since I am the author of the CHIP bill and I believe in it. I believe it has done so much good for our young people in this society. I really resent it being played politics with all the time, which our friends on the other side just can't resist.

CHIP has given children and their families access to quality healthcare coverage for over two decades. It was founded on the belief that the health of our future is too important to be dragged down by the political bickering of the present. Approximately 9 million children depend on this critical program. It is important to me. After several months of uncertainty, those 9 million children deserve the peace of mind that comes with a long-term CHIP extension.

As I noted here on the floor the other day, as chairman of the Finance Committee, I have been working with my Democratic counterparts on a bipartisan CHIP extension bill for months now. The committee's ranking member, Senator WYDEN, and I introduced our initial bill earlier, last fall. That bill would have reauthorized CHIP for 5 years. It was promptly reported out of

the Finance Committee with near-unanimous support. Then the Democrats decided to pretend that bill never existed.

As we worked through a crowded legislative calendar at the end of last year, my colleagues were well aware that efforts to reauthorize CHIP were ongoing. Yet many of our colleagues accused Republicans of neglecting vulnerable children.

I was leading the fight as one of the leading Republicans, as chairman of the Finance Committee, the author of the original bill, the one who has always voted for it. I just want a bill that works and not the political brouhaha that it always becomes whenever some of the Democrats think they can score some political points. The attacks on this front were fierce and usually high volume. I was personally attacked by colleagues in committee, here on the floor, and in the media. All kinds of vitriol was thrown in my direction both here in the Senate and out in the political intelligentsia. No one needs to worry about me, Madam President. I can take it and throw it right back, if it is necessary. But for months, colleagues have been coming to the floor or going on TV—pretty much anywhere with a camera—to accuse Republicans of wanting to take away health insurance for vulnerable children. Total BS. Yet they do it all the time because they, with their friends in the media, know they can get away with it in spite of the wrong they are doing.

Throughout all of this time, they conveniently neglected to mention that bipartisan efforts with regard to CHIP were moving forward, even though they clearly knew that such was the case. In fact, one of the harshest critics was an original cosponsor of our bill and a Senator who voted in support of our bill in committee.

This new bill before us would reauthorize CHIP for 6 years—something that has never been done before. A 6-year extension would be the largest and longest in the history of the program. We had already done that in the Finance Committee. In all other respects, the bill is identical to the one the Finance Committee reported with broad bipartisan support.

So where are our colleagues today? Is Senator WYDEN, who coauthored the committee's CHIP bill, prepared to vote for an even longer extension of the CHIP program? Apparently not. Are other Democrats on the Finance Committee, including those who publicly touted their support for the committee bill, prepared to vote for this extension? Apparently not. What about those Senate Democrats—both on and off the Finance Committee—who have been on their own righteous crusades with respect to CHIP? Are they prepared to vote for it today? Apparently not.

What has changed? Do they oppose something in the broader bill? No. Most Democrats have supported the

other healthcare elements in the package, including delays on the medical device tax, the health insurance tax, and the so-called Cadillac tax from ObamaCare. The bill would accomplish those goals as well. Think about that.

What about the Democrats? Have they championed those causes? Are they prepared to vote in favor of this bill? Apparently not. The question is, Why? Why are Democrats willing to filibuster this continuing resolution and shut down the government? What crazy, rightwing fantasy have we inserted into the bill? Of course I am being sarcastic. There is really nothing wrong with the substance of the bill, or at least very few of our Democratic colleagues are complaining about what is actually in the bill. Instead, they are complaining about what is not in it. The Democrats think they have struck political gold with immigration this week, so they are holding everything hostage so that they can stage another "righteous" crusade on the floor and in TV interviews.

It should go without saying that I personally would like to see a legislative fix for the so-called Dreamers—undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as children. This is an important matter that needs to be addressed. Not only are there myriad elements to our Nation's immigration system that are in dire need of reform, immigration isn't something that can be solved with a few roundtables with the President and some quick negotiations behind the scenes. It certainly isn't something we can or should try to solve under the threat of an imminent government shutdown. Unless you have been hiding in a cave or trapped under something very heavy for the past 15 years, you know that immigration reform—even piecemeal reform—is an extremely difficult lift. There are Members of both parties willing to work on this. The President has indicated his willingness as well. But some don't want to go the reasonable route, so here we are.

I get that there is an adage in this town that no one should let a good crisis go to waste, and I certainly understand the desire to strike when a political iron is hot. And in the eyes of most Democrats, that time is now. However, if they filibuster this legislation, they will be filibustering authorized funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. They will be voting to prevent this bipartisan effort—the one we have been talking about for years now—from moving forward; the one they have been harping about for years now from moving forward.

There is another political adage that goes around this town, one that horribly misquotes Napoleon. That axiom goes something like this: Never interrupt your opponent when they are making a mistake. Truthfully, I don't consider my Democratic colleagues to be my opponents, but a number of people, unfortunately, view Congress that way.

Setting those semantics aside, by urging my Democratic colleagues to vote in favor of this bill, I may very well be ignoring Napoleon's advice. Still, my colleagues have to know that if they vote to block this legislation, they will unequivocally be voting against a historically long-term Children's Health Insurance Program extension—the longest it has ever been, and I have had a lot to do with that. They will be voting to prolong the very crisis—that is their word, not mine—that they have been lamenting for the past several months. If they don't know that, the CHIP's advocates and stakeholders throughout the country know it, and the families and children who depend on CHIP will know it as well.

There is no reason for my colleagues to pit their righteous crusade on immigration against their righteous crusade for CHIP. This is simply a matter of priorities. Today, the priority should be to keep the government open and to ensure funding for CHIP well into the future.

As I said, offering my colleagues this advice may amount to stepping in the way of an opponent's mistake, but the politics on this issue must stop. The right answer in this case is pretty obvious. The right vote is one in favor of the House-passed continuing resolution.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

Look, I get so tired of the cheap politics that are played. When they are played on a bill like CHIP—virtually everybody is going to vote for it. Everybody agrees with or wants to agree with or has claimed credit for it. That makes you wonder what is going on.

I think I have the right to speak on this because I am the original author of CHIP. I wrote the original language. I was the one who got the committee to go for it. I was the one who went to Ted Kennedy—representing the Democrats—to come on board, and he did, and it brought both sides together. I am sure he is up there wondering, what is the matter with my side down there? And he ought to be.

It hasn't been easy to do all that, but we did it. It works. It has helped millions of children. It will help 9 million children now. It is something everybody in this Senate ought to be for and ought to quit playing games with. Unfortunately, some people think they can score points by playing games with something like CHIP. It is not only wrong, it is abysmal.

I love my colleagues. There are some I love more than others, but I love all of them. I have to say, the ones I love more than others are those who really are honest and deliberative, who really want to do what is right while they are here and who are willing to work with others to get there, who are willing to work in a bipartisan manner to be able to bring these things to pass.

I understand the differences between the two parties. I understand the poli-

tics that are constantly being played around here. But if we are going to play politics, play it on something other than CHIP. Play it on something that deserves the political ramifications. CHIP does not.

CHIP is something that we all know works and works in the best interests of our children. It is something that we as Federal employees can all work on and do, that we go home and feel really good about it and know we have done something really worthwhile. I can say that because I am the original author of the CHIP bill, and I have been for it ever since. I was the one who got Senator Kennedy to come on board and to help with it, and that brought a lot of Democrats on board, as well, because if Kennedy was on board, they could be on board. I was the one who got a lot of Republicans on board, like he was getting Democrats. In other words, the two of us made this system work—and not just the two of us but people in the House and other Senators here in the Senate. A lot of people deserve a lot of credit for the CHIP bill.

Now we are sitting here arguing about something that we shouldn't have to argue about. It is disappointing to me, and I am disappointed in the politics that are being played around CHIP. There are better arguments on other bills than there are on the CHIP bill. Everybody knows that CHIP is going to pass one way or the other, so naturally our friends on the other side—maybe even some on our side—want to hang whatever they can on the CHIP bill, knowing that the American people want it, that Senators want it, that the House of Representatives has proven that they want it, and they might be able to score a few political points.

Well, I want the two leaders to get together and get this matter resolved, and let's quit playing these silly games that are so often played around here. I don't mind them maybe on the bills that are lesser in import and nature, but to do it on the CHIP bill, my gosh, it is incredible to me.

This is the greatest country in the world, but we do have some really stupid people representing it from time to time. With that—I probably have gone too far saying that, but it is true, and it is disappointing to me.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, let me start by agreeing with the Senator from Utah that we should extend the Children's Health Insurance Program. We should do it for 6 years. I want to commend the Senator from Utah for his work in creating the CHIP program, along with Senator KENNEDY. It is good work, and we need to extend it.

We also have an obligation as Senators, on a bipartisan basis, to get together and put together a budget for the United States of America. We are now 4 months into the current fiscal

year, and we do not have a budget that provides the resources necessary for the Department of Defense. We do not have a budget that provides resources to fight the opioid epidemic. There has been a lot of talk here in the U.S. Senate about fighting the opioid epidemic, but we have no resources to do that. We need a budget to get that done.

So, yes, we should extend the Children's Health Insurance Program. We need to do that. But we also need to do our job—which we should have done back on October 1, the first day of this fiscal year—and actually adopt a bipartisan budget for the United States of America.

The tragedy right now is that at midnight tonight the government will shut down unless the Senate Republican leadership comes to its senses and supports a bipartisan budget agreement—a bipartisan agreement, which is really in plain sight right here in the U.S. Senate.

Look, the American people understand very clearly that Republicans control the White House, Republicans control both Houses of Congress, and with that comes a responsibility to govern for the good of the entire country and not focus on narrow, partisan interests. Instead, what we have here as the clock ticks is dysfunction and chaos.

Yesterday I heard the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, say on the Senate floor that he would not support a bipartisan agreement, reached by Senators right here, unless he knew where President Trump stood on those issues. Then, in the same breath, he indicated he did not know where President Trump stood on those key issues.

The Senate is a separate and equal branch of the U.S. Government with its own constitutional responsibilities. We have a bipartisan agreement here on so many of these issues. We should not now be outsourcing our constitutional duties to a White House that, according to Senator MCCONNELL, doesn't know where it stands on these issues.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM had it right when he said that we don't have a reliable negotiating partner at the White House. And, in the last week, we heard President Trump's own Chief of Staff, General Kelly, acknowledge that the President was "uninformed" on some of the issues being debated here.

So let's do our job as the U.S. Senate, with our own responsibilities under the Constitution, and not say that we have to wait on a dysfunctional White House and not say that we have to wait on a President who once tweeted out that we need "a good government shutdown." There are no good government shutdowns, and we should be doing everything we can to avoid one at midnight tonight.

So let's actually do our job here, and let's come up with a budget for the United States for this fiscal year.

A small business could not survive without putting together its budget. It does great harm to our country and to

our government when this Congress cannot get its act together and put together a budget in time. We have now been kicking the can down the road month by month since October 1. That is why Senator GRAHAM said this morning: "I am not going to support continuing this fiasco for 30 more days. It's time Congress stop the cycle of dysfunction, grow up, and act consistent with the values of a great nation."

Amen to that. That is our constitutional duty. That is what we need to do in order to protect our military and other vital investments important to our country and our economy.

Here is what the Pentagon's chief spokesperson said about continuing resolutions: They are wasteful, they are destructive, and the longer they go the worse it is.

She went on to say that these continuing resolutions erode our defense capabilities and have negative consequences for them.

Why in the world do we want to kick the can down the road another 30 days when we can get it done right now and avert a government shutdown?

We need that budget to support our military. We also need it to support the critical investment in our kids' education. We need a budget plan that is going to provide veterans the healthcare they deserve. We need a budget that is going to fight the opioid epidemic—one that keeps community health centers open. The Social Security Administration has faced hundreds of millions of dollars of cuts. They are not going to be able to do their job in making sure folks get their Social Security benefits on time if we continue to strangle their budget.

The sad thing is, we have known about all of these issues since last September. I am glad we have come to some resolution on the issue of the Children's Health Insurance Program. We have known about that since last September. But we have also known about the need to fight the opioid epidemic. We have known about the need to fund community health centers. We have known about the need to make sure our veterans have the healthcare they deserve. And we have known about the need to address the DACA issue—the Dreamers—because it was last September when President Trump revoked the DACA Program, effective a very short time from now. That program had made sure that Dreamers could be here legally in the United States, contributing to our country. So when President Trump took that action, he manufactured the crisis we are in now.

But he also said: OK, I am going to revoke this legal status—this program—but I want Congress, on a bipartisan basis, to come up with a long-term solution. That is what he said back then, and he said the same thing just a few weeks ago. I think the Nation saw him on TV, when he invited a bipartisan group of Senators and Mem-

bers of the House to the White House, and he invited everybody to come up with a solution.

A number of our Senators, on a bipartisan basis, took the President up on his request. That is when Senator GRAHAM and Senator DURBIN and two other Republicans and two other Democrats came up with a plan, which now has very broad support, including the support of seven Republican Senators. So they did exactly what President Trump asked them to do, and they addressed all of the issues that President Trump outlined.

I think we know what happened after that. Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN went to the White House to present their bipartisan agreement to the President, and, meanwhile, he invited some other Senators over. They sabotaged the deal, and the President made repulsive, racist remarks at that meeting. So the President, who had asked Senators to come up with a solution on a bipartisan basis, when they did what he asked, threw it back in their face.

Why is the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, now saying to the Senate that we can't do our job here until I know what is going to happen at the White House? Why should we be outsourcing our constitutional responsibilities to the White House when we have an agreement which, if it were put on the floor of the Senate today, would pass? It is a bipartisan solution.

I really believe it is time for us to do our job here, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Here is what President Trump said at the time of the last government shutdown. That is when we had a 16-day shutdown because some of the Republican Senators didn't want to fund the Affordable Care Act at the time and shut down the government for 16 days. Then Citizen Trump said: "It always happens to be the top. I mean, the problems start from the top and have to get solved from the top."

This is what Citizen Donald Trump was saying about President Obama at the time of the last shutdown.

He went on to say: "The president is the leader, and he's got to get everybody in a room, and he's got to lead."

How times change when Citizen Trump becomes President Trump. You have a White House in chaos, dysfunction. Senator GRAHAM himself said it: an unreliable negotiating partner.

Yet, the Republican leader wants this Senate to outsource our job to the President of the United States and says that we are going to shut down the government here because we don't know what President Trump thinks about all this. That is a dereliction of the duty of the Senate, and we need to do our job today and avoid a government shutdown.

The answer is in plain sight. Let's get to work. Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are here today because Republicans and President Trump have failed in their most basic responsibility as the governing party, bringing us mere hours away from an unnecessary and consequential government shutdown.

Let's be clear. With Republicans in control of the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, the only person to blame if the government shuts down will be President Donald Trump.

Later today, I plan to vote no on the government funding bill that the House of Representatives has sent over to the Senate because it provides no certainty or resolution for Dreamers, pensioners, veterans, the people of Puerto Rico, or vulnerable children and patients across the country. I cannot support legislation that fails to ensure that we are fulfilling our moral and constitutional obligation to the American people.

Sadly, this budget process is just a continuation of a pattern from Republicans in Congress: Draft major policy in secret, with no debate, no Democrats, no real opportunity to negotiate. First, they did it on healthcare. Then, they did it on tax reform. Now, they are doing it again on the continuing budget resolution.

There is a great song in the musical "Hamilton" titled "The Room Where It Happens." Well, the Democrats aren't even told where the room is. Republicans aren't negotiating deals. They are delivering fiats, not just to the Democrats but to the American people, and the American people are the ones paying the price.

We cannot let this craven, half-measure of a bill fool us. Yes, this legislation does finally reauthorize and fund a program that provides healthcare for 9 million children across this country, known as the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. But remember, just like they are abdicating their role in governing today and have been throughout the budget negotiations, Republicans in Congress allowed CHIP to expire at the end of September—more than 100 days ago.

Why would Republicans do such a thing for a program they now say is so vital and bipartisan? Because 100 days ago the Republican caucus was preoccupied with their unsuccessful attempt at repealing the Affordable Care Act. For weeks on end, they held America in suspension as they secretly wrote and rewrote a bill that would rip healthcare coverage away from tens of millions of Americans while taking a machete to Medicaid.

Thankfully, this dangerous bill failed to gain support from enough Senate

Republicans to pass. But when that irresponsible bill failed, instead of immediately returning to the important business of providing low- and middle-income children healthcare, the Republicans decided to use their energy to jam through a massive tax scam with giveaways for millionaires and billionaires, once again leaving children's health and working families in limbo. Republicans were more interested in a tax bill of corporate welfare than in children's healthcare.

Congress provided a Band-Aid for CHIP at the end of last year, enough funding to support some States through today. Yet the absence of a real solution has consequences. CHIP families remain worried about paying for their children's medications, getting them a checkup, or receiving that unexpected, devastating, and expensive diagnosis for their young child. Healthcare providers remain terrified that they will have to cut services to medically complex children and other pediatric patients they serve. States still lack the certainty and assurances needed to fully operate CHIP for their residents. Many are still contemplating contingency plans should the Federal Government not meet their end of the bargain and provide funds needed for CHIP to succeed.

These last 100 days of anxiety and uncertainty represent uncharted territory for this popular program. For two decades, CHIP has provided affordable, comprehensive health insurance to children of working families and pregnant women. In 2016, CHIP covered nearly 9 million children throughout the United States. Some 2 million of them are chronically ill, with asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, or developmental disorders. In Massachusetts, CHIP has been instrumental in getting nearly all of our children covered.

Without continued Federal funding, Massachusetts alone could lose approximately \$295 million annually in Federal CHIP dollars. That would be devastating for the 172,000 Bay State children who rely on CHIP for their health coverage.

Ironically, over 3 months ago, Senate leaders in both parties came up with a bipartisan agreement on what the next 5 years of CHIP would look like. But Republicans insisted we had to pay for CHIP by raiding other important programs, like the Prevention and Public Health Fund, which is used to help prevent child illness by providing vaccines, among things. The stopgap funding measure passed in December cut \$750 million from the Prevention and Public Health Fund for a short-term spending patch. It was robbing Peter to pay Paul.

So we are hours away from shutting down the government, with the superrich still celebrating their \$1 trillion tax break and congressional Republicans still scheming at ways to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, and still punting a solution for Dreamers, veterans, pensioners, and for

the people of Puerto Rico. While I remain supportive of the CHIP program, I do not support the legislative malpractice Republicans performed on the continuing resolution.

But that wasn't the first time Republicans tried to pay for one healthcare need with another, and CHIP is not the only victim of Republican political games. I cannot support the House legislation because it provides no funding to address the greatest public health crisis facing our Nation today—the opioid crisis.

When President Trump declared the opioid crisis a national public health emergency in October, he laid out his vision that “we can be the generation that ends the opioid epidemic.” On that, he is right. But we know that a vision without funding is a hallucination. We need real funding to implement real solutions.

The White House Council of Economic Advisers estimated that the opioid epidemic cost the country \$500 billion in 2015. How much has the Trump administration devoted to this crisis? Zero dollars, not a nickel, since Donald Trump was sworn in as President. Now there is news that the Trump administration might slash the budget of the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent. That isn't a commitment to the crisis. That is an abdication.

Asking our States, our cities, and towns to continue fighting this scourge of opioid overdoses without additional Federal funding is irresponsible, it is cruel, and it will come back to haunt us as a Nation. These budget negotiations were an ideal opportunity to fund what my colleagues in both parties have said publicly is important—combating the opioid crisis. Instead, we are leaving families without hope or help. We owe it to them and the millions like them across the country to fight as hard as possible for the funding they need.

We should also remember as we look at this House legislation that so many of the patients seeking treatment and recovery services for opioid addiction rely on their community health centers. But if this funding measure passes, Republicans will have irresponsibly and unfairly left funding for community health centers in limbo. That funding also expired more than 100 days ago.

For more than 50 years, community health centers have been an integral component of our social safety net. This movement, which started in Massachusetts, has transformed how we treat some of our most medically vulnerable citizens, while also improving the health and wellness of our communities. In fact, for many Americans, community health centers are the only access point for affordable healthcare. In Massachusetts, it treats more than 750,000 patients, and 16 percent of these patients are uninsured and nearly half are on Medicaid. In addition to the quality, comprehensive care they pro-

vide, community health centers play a key economic role in many regions across the country. Community health centers in Massachusetts have created more than 12,000 jobs, including more than 8,500 direct full-time employees. Much like CHIP, unfortunately, Republicans have denied community health centers the certainty of funding they need, forcing them to make tough decisions that ultimately impact their ability to fulfill their mission and care for the people of their communities.

I have heard from community health centers across the Commonwealth that Congress's inability to reauthorize funding has made new physicians reluctant to practice at their facilities, further straining an already depleting workforce. New staff to address burgeoning infectious health outbreaks, like the flu, cannot be hired, hampering the health center's ability to respond to the needs of the community.

These facilities are often the backbones of their communities, and for more than 100 days, we have been hamstringing their ability to do their jobs. It is shameful, and it is unacceptable.

Throughout the 100-day war on some of our most important healthcare programs, Democrats have been calling on Republicans to invite us into the room, to sit down on a bipartisan basis and work through our differences to come to a solution on CHIP, on community health centers, on opioid funding, and, of course, on our Dreamers. Instead, we are in a governmental paralysis, fixing only a fraction of the problems Republicans created while the President continues to focus on the campaign trail and fails in finding a solution for our country. For Republicans, this newest CR, yet again, means nothing more than “Can't Resolve.” The American people deserve so much more than that. The American people are tired of waiting on their government to do the right thing. Lives are depending on it. It has been 5 months since the fiscal year started, and we still don't have a budget. That is unacceptable.

Republicans are shedding crocodile tears about our military and national security being at risk during a government shutdown. Do you know what is harmful to our national defense—month-to-month budgets and operating by way of continuing resolutions. That is no way to run the Defense Department, but that is exactly what the Republicans have done with these short-term budget fixes. Spare me, spare America your crocodile tears because it is time to sit down, on a bipartisan basis, and get a budget done—a budget that would take care of the Defense Department, the opioid crisis, pensions, veterans, CHIP, community health centers, and it would give some certitude to the American people that this body knows how to govern. Instead of engaging in budget brinksmanship, we need Republicans and President Trump to engage in bipartisanship. It is time we end this waiting game now and provide

the certainty and funding necessary so all of these critical priorities are addressed, not just the ones Republicans care about.

The Republican paradox is that they don't believe in government, but they have to run for office in order to make sure the government doesn't work, and now that they control the House, the Senate, and Presidency, we have reached their perfect state where the government cannot work because it is being paralyzed by the party that controls all of these branches. They refuse to talk to Democrats. They refuse to ensure that the Constitution is implemented, where Democrats and Republicans, working together on both sides of this building, plus the President, sit down in the room in order to cut the deals. Until President Trump is willing to sit down with CHUCK SCHUMER and NANCY PELOSI and MITCH MCCONNELL and PAUL RYAN in the room, we will not get a resolution on these issues.

Mr. President, come to the Hill. Mr. President, sit down with all of the people who want to resolve these issues for the American people. Mr. President, do your job.

Bill Belichick says to the New England Patriots: If you want to win, do your job.

The same thing is true for you, Mr. President. Do your job. Come together with Democrats and Republicans. Stop carping critically from the outside at any move Democrats or Republicans make. Instead, get in the room. We can resolve these issues for the American people. The time is now, Mr. President. Do your job.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The able Senator from Utah.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, today hundreds of thousands of Americans from all walks of life will participate in the 45th annual March for Life. This begs the question, Why do all these citizens march year after year? It certainly isn't for their health or for the media coverage. No, these Americans march on behalf of those who cannot. They march for uniquely vulnerable members of the human family. They march for the unborn, for those threatened by abortion, and for the countless millions of innocent lives already lost. These Americans march to protest the legal regime that sustains abortion.

The cornerstone of that crumbling edifice is *Roe v. Wade*, the 1973 Supreme Court case that invented a right to abortion in the Constitution, and in so doing, it stripped the unborn of their right to life. The principal effect of *Roe v. Wade* on our culture has been to cheapen the value of humanity itself. *Roe* has insinuated into the law a poisonous notion, the notion that some human beings may be treated as things, as objects to be discarded when they are inconvenient. We have seen this before in human history, but an unintended effect of *Roe* has been to

kick-start a movement that has lasted four and one-half decades. *Roe* did not resolve the abortion debate, although it tried to. Rather, it intensified that very debate.

The Nation's conscience was not deadened by *Roe*'s euphemisms and evasions. Rather, it was brought to life. Like a firebell in the night, *Roe* awakened a generation of Americans to the injustice of abortion. Countless thousands of them are marching in Washington, DC, in Salt Lake City, and in cities all across the country today, but the institution of abortion still has its stalwart defenders—vociferous defenders even.

One may ask, Why does this issue arouse such anger and such passion, as it so often does? I argue that it is because the pro-life and pro-abortion movements offer competing and mutually inconsistent visions, moral visions for our society; indeed, competing arguments about human dignity and even about what it means to be human in the first place. Both moral visions are, in one sense, as old as the Nation. They have appeared in various guises throughout American history.

There is a consistent trend in how the clash of visions has played out in every era. The vision advanced by the pro-life movement has inspired righteous protests. The other vision has been used to rationalize hideous injustices. The pro-life vision embraces our country's noblest truth. The pro-abortion vision twists it.

Let me explain what I mean. Our Declaration of Independence contains some of the most succinct, profound, and revolutionary statements in human history. "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

We know the United States has not always acted on this high principle. It has not always behaved in a manner consistent with it. We have, at times, denied life, liberty, and opportunity to our fellow beings in countless cruel and unfortunate ways, but even in the darkest times, patriots and reformers have looked to this passage as a guiding light because it is, in many respects, the conscience of our Nation.

Abraham Lincoln referred to the Declaration of Independence constantly in his speeches, calling it the "sheet anchor of American republicanism" and the "Father of all moral principle." He called the Declaration of Independence a statement on human equality, the "electric cord" that links Patriotic Americans through the ages. Now that electric cord has reached us. It is a direct line that runs from the founding generation to the very heart of the pro-life movement today. The core conviction of the pro-life movement is that "all men are created equal" and that all have a right to life. We believe that every human being has dignity and merits protection simply by virtue of being human.

You will often hear pro-lifers emphasize the human features of unborn children, as well we should. We point out that the human heart begins to beat as early as 16 days after conception. We point out that the unborn child can yawn, react to pain, and even suck her thumb. We point out that the thumb even has a unique one-of-a-kind fingerprint.

We don't mention these characteristics because they are what give children their worth. It is not our fingerprints or even our beating hearts or our ability to yawn that make us human, that make us people. Rather, we point to these characteristics because they in turn point to something far more fundamental. They point to the inescapable fact that the unborn child is a human being, just like us. It is that endowment, it is that shared humanity that gives us all moral worth.

To summarize the pro-life position, we have only to repeat those five words in the Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal." All, therefore, are entitled to life, but to be sure, not everyone shares all men are created equal. At various times, this very belief that is so much at the core of who we are and what we believe as Americans has been called an "error[r] of the past generation." It has even been called a "self-evident lie!"

Few today would denounce the Declaration of Independence in such terms, but defenders of abortion still repudiate the declaration by their very actions and by the arguments they advance to protect abortion. Defenders of abortion no longer dispute that unborn children are living human beings. How could they? Science testifies unequivocally to our shared humanity. Most sophisticated defenders of abortion do not even dispute that abortion is a violent act.

If you don't believe me on this point, perhaps you will believe Ronald Dworkin, a prominent apologist for the pro-choice position: "Abortion," Dworkin writes, "[is] deliberately killing a developing human embryo." He goes on to describe abortion as a "choic[e] for death."

If abortion defenders do not deny the humanity of the fetus, and if they do not deny that abortion kills the fetus, how then do they defend abortion? In short, they do it by segregating the human family into two classes: human beings who are worthy of life—sometimes called human persons—and human beings who are unworthy of life, human nonpersons.

According to this view, human beings do not deserve protection on the basis of their humanity alone. Rather, they acquire the right to life when they attain certain characteristics—usually some level of cognitive ability or bodily development. Since the unborn lack these magical personhood qualities, they lack the right to life and may be dismembered in the womb. They are human nonpersons or so the argument goes.

There are many problems with this chilling view. It has been rebutted at length by smarter men and women than I. For the purposes of today, it is enough to point out the track record of this argument is dubious. It just so happens that every time mankind has been artificially divided into classes, into persons and nonpersons—based on their race, sex, genetic fitness, or any other attribute—the result has been calamity, which leads to a very simple question that has never been satisfactorily answered by abortion defenders: Why should we believe that this time is any different?

Abortion is a very difficult subject matter for so many reasons, but on another level, it is really quite simple. Our society has to choose between the two visions of human dignity described above.

Put simply, do we believe that all men are created equal or that some, perhaps, are somehow more equal than others?

This simple question deserves a simple response. We must choose the first of these options and affirm that all human beings are created with dignity, and we must reject all attempts to separate the human family into higher and lower classes. Let us see these attempts for what they are—cruel fictions that cheapen life itself.

Just as there is no such thing as life unworthy of life, there is no such thing as a human nonperson. There are just people, and we are each fearfully and wonderfully made.

Yes, dignity was ours before we stirred in the womb. It is stamped onto the very fabric of our genome. It is printed onto our souls. This is the truth so brilliantly proclaimed in our Nation's founding documents, even as it is denied by our legal system, starting with *Roe v. Wade*. Yet, even though the laws of man are against us for now, the truth is with us, and the truth can erode even the most formidable edifice of lies.

So, on this 45th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, let's respond to *Roe* as Frederick Douglass responded to a similar indignity in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*: "Happily for the whole human family," Douglass thundered, "their rights have been defined, declared, and decided in a court higher than the Supreme Court."

Those words are as true today as they were when they were spoken. They call on us to continue the winding march for justice and for life until the unalienable rights of every human being are respected in our land.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I come before my colleagues in the Senate to urge in the strongest possible terms that the Republican leadership here accept its responsibility and not allow the Government of the United States of America to shut down. Republicans control the Senate. They control the U.S. House. And a Republican is in the

White House. Please do not shut the government down.

A government shutdown will be extremely distressing and difficult for millions of people in every State in our country who utilize government services. A government shutdown will be extremely painful for millions of Federal employees who depend upon their paychecks to provide for their families. A government shutdown will make it much more difficult for U.S. military personnel, the men and women who are putting their lives on the line to defend us, to do their jobs.

The American people do not want a government shutdown. I do not want a government shutdown, and I believe that most of my Republican colleagues do not want a government shutdown. It is imperative that President Trump understand that despite what he said in May, that statement is wrong. When he said our country needs a good shutdown, that is wrong. Our country does not need a good shutdown. What we need is an annual budget that addresses the many needs of the American people.

Just last night, this is what a spokesperson from the Pentagon stated:

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military.

This afternoon, I say to Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader here in the Senate: Please do not shut the government down. You know, Senator MCCONNELL, the political reality as well as anybody in our country. In the Senate, you need 60 votes to pass this budget agreement. You don't have 60 votes. Please, sit down with Democrats, and start negotiating in good faith. Please, do not shut the government down.

More and more Democrats are sick and tired of kicking the can down the road, tired of our not addressing the major crises that are facing this country, tired of running a \$4 trillion operation, which is what the U.S. Government is, on a month-to-month basis.

Yet it is not just the Democrats who are demanding that we finally have an annual budget. It is the Republicans as well. My understanding—what I have heard from the news media—is that there are now five Republicans who are prepared to vote against this continuing resolution and even more who have voiced deep concerns about the lack of an annual budget. They know and I know that just passing another temporary budget is totally irresponsible and is abdicating the job that we were elected to do.

What the American people understand—what every businessperson in this country understands, what every family in America understands—is that you cannot run a government, given the many crises that we face, on a month-to-month basis. We cannot continue to abdicate our responsibility.

Finally, we must address the problems that are facing the American people.

Last night, the Pentagon told us correctly—and I state again that this is what was said: "We need a fully-funded FY18 budget or face ramifications on our military."

Let's not forget that we are 3½ months into the fiscal year. There are 3½ months that have come and gone, and the Republican leadership here has still not given us an annual budget.

It is not just the military that faces a crisis situation because of the lack of an annual budget. Today, 27 million Americans get their primary healthcare, dental care, mental health counseling, and low-cost prescription drugs through the community health center program. In my State of Vermont, one out of four Vermonters gets his primary healthcare through a community health center. There are 3½ months that have come and gone since the beginning of this fiscal year, and the Republicans have not yet reauthorized funding for the community health center program, which is now facing a severe crisis in terms of recruiting and retaining the doctors, nurses, and other medical staff it needs to maintain the quality of service it must maintain.

What doctor or what nurse is going to go to a community health center when he or she doesn't even know if that facility is going to receive funding? There are 27 million Americans who depend upon community health centers. As I understand it—and I am glad—the Republicans are now prepared to reauthorize the CHIP program. There are 9 million kids who need that program. In the 3½ months that have come and gone, finally, they are talking about reauthorizing CHIP. That is good, but you cannot forget the community health centers.

The community health center program in this country is 50 years old. It was developed in the 1960s. It is supported by virtually every Democrat and, I think, the vast majority of the Republicans. Yet it has not been reauthorized. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed and addressed now.

On Veterans Day, everybody here goes running all over the country, giving great speeches about how much they love the veterans, but the Veterans Health Administration cannot continue to provide decent, quality care to those of our veterans who put their lives on the line to defend us when they have over 30,000 vacancies. In Vermont and around the country, the VA provides good, quality care, but you cannot provide care in a timely manner when you have 30,000 vacancies at the VA. This issue cannot be kicked down the road. It must be addressed now, not next year.

As everybody knows, in Louisiana and in Vermont and all over this country, there is a horrible, horrific opioid and heroin epidemic that is sweeping this country. It has hit my State of

Vermont hard. It has hit States all over America. Last year, 60,000 people in our country died as a result of opioid or heroin overdoses. We need to help State governments, local communities, families, and police departments to address the opioid and heroin epidemic. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It must be addressed now, not through a continuing resolution that absolutely ignores this crisis. It must be addressed now.

Last year, unbelievably, some 10,000 people with disabilities died while awaiting decisions for the applications they made to the Social Security Administration for their disability benefits to be approved. People with disabilities apply for benefits. They wait, they wait, and they wait. Last year, 10,000 people with disabilities died while waiting for decisions. Many of them died because the Social Security Administration is, today, grossly underfunded, understaffed, and simply not able to deal with the volume of claims they have received.

It is not just people with disabilities. In my State of Vermont—I hear this every day—there are older Americans who are not getting the quality of service they need from the Social Security Administration. Our job is to adequately fund the Social Security Administration so it can protect the needs of senior citizens and people with disabilities in our country. This is a crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed now, and this continuing resolution, which I presume we are going to vote on later today, does not deal with it.

Mr. President, 1½ million Americans are in danger of seeing their pensions cut by up to 60 percent. These are truckdrivers, construction workers, machinists, and others who have worked their entire careers with the expectation that they would receive a decent pension when they retired. We have a responsibility to protect the pensions of these hard-working Americans and keep the promises that were made to them. This is another crisis that cannot be kicked down the road. It has to be addressed now, and the continuing resolution that is going to come before us has not one word to say about that.

Then we have a child care crisis in this country. Millions of working families can't find quality, affordable child care. We have a student debt crisis in this country—40 million people, many of them deeply in debt, unable to get on with their lives for the crime of having gone to college. That is a crisis that we have to deal with. We have an infrastructure crisis in this country. All over America, roads, bridges, water systems, waste water plants are collapsing. How do we continue to ignore those crises? At a time of massive income and wealth inequality, when the rich are getting richer and everybody else is getting poorer, our job in Congress is not just to give tax breaks to billionaires. Our job is not just to try

to throw 32 million Americans off the health insurance they have or deny the reality of climate change or to end net neutrality or make racist comments about countries throughout the world. Our job is to represent the needs of ordinary Americans. We cannot continue to ignore these problems. We cannot continue to kick the can down the road.

Once again, I say to the majority leader: Let us begin to negotiate in good faith. Let us reach decisions that will improve life for the American people, not simply ignore their needs.

When we talk about the crises facing this country, we are also talking about a crisis precipitated by President Trump in September of last year. As a result of President Trump's rescinding of President Obama's Executive order on DACA, some 800,000 young people in our country are today living in fear, uncertainty, and anxiety. If we do not act—and act now—it is possible that many of these young people will lose their legal status and be subjected to the possibility of deportation. This must not be allowed to happen.

This issue to my mind is one of the great moral issues of our time. These young people, who were brought into this country, some at 2 years of age, 3 years, 5 years of age, are people who have lived virtually their entire lives in the United States of America. They are working, they are in school, they are in the military, and 20,000 of these young DACA people are now teaching in schools throughout the country.

It would be one of the cruelest acts in modern American history or our history in general if we said to these young people, who know no other country but the United States of America, that they could be deported from our shores. It would be an unspeakable crime, and we must not allow that to happen. That is not just the opinion of Senator BERNIE SANDERS; that is the overwhelming point of view of the American people, of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

A poll just came out last night from CBS. The poll showed that 87 percent of the American people believe that we should protect the legal status of the Dreamers—87 percent—and that poll is consistent with poll after poll after poll. The people of the United States across the political spectrum are saying that we cannot turn our backs on these Dreamers. The vast majority of people believe we must provide a path toward citizenship.

There is now bipartisan legislation that has been written by Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and others, and I say to Senator MCCONNELL: If 87 percent of the American people think we should provide legal status to the Dreamers, let us do our job. Let us pass this legislation. This is not a profile in courage. This is what the American people want, and let us do what the American people want.

As we well know, terrible, terrible hurricanes struck Texas, Florida, Puer-

to Rico, and the Virgin Islands months and months ago, and people there are still suffering. Many people in Puerto Rico today still do not have electricity. Then there are devastating wildfires and mud slides that have taken place in California. How long does it take for this Congress to respond to the crises facing our fellow Americans?

What I say is, we were elected to do our jobs in representing the American people. That is what we are paid to do. We cannot run a government on a month-to-month basis. Senator MCCONNELL does not have the 60 votes he needs, and now is the time for him to sit down with the Democratic leadership and negotiate a serious agreement on the budget situation, on parity between defense and nondefense spending. Negotiate a serious agreement on DACA, providing legal status and a path toward citizenship for our 800,000 young people; negotiate a serious agreement on disaster relief.

The truth of the matter is, we can do it. We can do it. The differences of opinion are not that wide, but we cannot do it and will not do it unless we finally sit down and start negotiating in a serious manner. That is what I implore Senator MCCONNELL to do.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARCH FOR LIFE

MR. THUNE. Mr. President, today, as they do every year at this time, tens of thousands of Americans from across the country, including from my home State of South Dakota, will march from the National Mall to the U.S. Supreme Court to stand up for the right to life. The march is always inspiring with the huge crowds who come year after year, the commitment and enthusiasm of the participants, and most of all, the young people—teenagers, college students, young adults.

Abortion has been an ugly scar on our Nation for a long while now, but seeing all these young people at the March for Life every year fills me with hope because I know that these young people get it. They know that life matters, and they are ready and willing to stand up and say that, to stand up for the hundreds of thousands of unborn Americans who are killed every year in this country by abortion.

This year, I hope to see Congress consider the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would protect unborn children who have reached the age of 20 weeks—that is 5 months of pregnancy—from being killed by abortion. Right now, there are only seven countries in the world that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Among those

countries are China, North Korea, and the United States of America. I would like to suggest that is not the company Americans want to be keeping when it comes to protecting human rights.

Mr. President, 63 percent of the American people support a ban on abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy, and that doesn't surprise me. Take a look at a 5-month-old unborn baby on an ultrasound. It is pretty darn obvious that is a human being in there. I think most people instinctively know that human beings, no matter how small they are, are worthy of protection.

Five months into a pregnancy, babies are doing a lot. They are sucking their thumbs. They are yawning and stretching. They are actively moving around. They are responding to noises, and they feel and respond to pain. The scientific evidence on this point is clear: 5 months into a pregnancy, unborn babies feel pain. Yet, in our country, it is legal to abort these babies. The procedures used to perform these abortions are so brutal and inhuman that it is difficult to even talk about them. Most Americans would rightly shrink from treating an animal the way we treat unborn human beings.

Every year, there are hundreds of thousands of abortions in this country. Planned Parenthood reports that it performed 321,384 abortions in 2016. That number is so large that it is hard to fathom. To put that into some kind of perspective, that is equivalent to more than one-third of the population of my home State of South Dakota. Unfortunately, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would not eliminate all of these abortions, but it would make a difference, and it would bring us one step closer to the day when every child born and unborn is protected in law.

To all those who are marching for life today, thank you for being here. Thank you for reminding all of us about an injustice that it is all too easy for us to ignore. Thank you for standing up for all those babies. The fight may be long, but I know that at the end of the day, it is life that will win.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, before coming to Washington today, I went to Annapolis. The Maryland General Assembly is in session. I had a chance to meet with several of our regional delegations in the Maryland General Assembly, our senators and members of the house, and obviously the question that was asked the most is, What is happening in regard to the Federal Government? What is happening in re-

gard to the fiscal year 2018 budget? Will the government be funded past midnight tonight?

I must tell you, I was talking to both Democratic and Republican members of the Maryland General Assembly, and there was a common concern. You see, the Maryland General Assembly will shortly be receiving from Governor Hogan the fiscal year 2019 budget. A good part of any State's budget is the Federal funding programs. Neither the State of Maryland nor any of our local jurisdictions had the fiscal year 2018 budget, let alone a blueprint for likely action by Congress for the fiscal year 2019 budget.

The budget should have been passed by October 1 of last year. That is the beginning of the fiscal year. We have been operating under continuing resolutions during the entire part of this year. In fact, we have been operating under continuing resolutions for years, and it is causing significant damage to this country.

The Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and they can't pass a budget for our country. So when the Republican leadership asked us in September of last year for a continuing resolution to have more time to negotiate a budget for fiscal year 2018, we had no choice but to go along with the continuing resolution to give more time. But then on three additional occasions the Republican leadership has come forward saying: We need additional time.

I remember the debate we had in December before the holidays. The leadership was very clear that this would be the last continuing resolution that was going to be needed. They were close to working out deals, et cetera, only to find out today that we are still no closer to getting it resolved.

Here is the tragedy: Our agencies cannot exist on continuing resolutions. They hit a point where they are no longer able to carry out their mission in the best interests of the American people. We heard that last night on the floor of the Senate when the representative of the Department of Defense indicated that our Nation's preparedness, readiness, cannot be maintained by a continuing resolution with last year's budget.

You see, a continuing resolution does not reflect our current priorities. It is where we were the last time we passed the budget, which was over a year ago. Those are the spending priorities an agency must comply with.

For the Department of Defense, a lot has happened during that period of time. Look at what is happening in North Korea. Look at what is happening with Russia. Look at what is happening around the world. Our Department of Defense needs to have a current-year budget, not another continuing resolution. We have to reach this decision.

So here is our concern: If we just continue to go along with these continuing resolutions, we are going to hurt our

national security. We are going to hurt our agencies' ability to get their work done. It is going to cost the taxpayers of this country more money, and they are not going to get the services they need.

To me, there is an alternative to this date that we need to consider, and that is, let's complete our work. I know we have a deadline of midnight tonight. I know the government will shut down unless we get something done. I must tell you, we should make sure the government stays open. No one wins when there is a government shutdown. But we are not doing anyone any favors if we don't commit ourselves to get the job done.

What I would urge Leader McCONNELL to do is to allow us to vote on a very short-term continuing resolution and keep us here over this weekend; keep us here until we get the basics of the fiscal year 2018 budget complete. That, we can do.

We know that there have been reported conversations between the leadership on the Appropriations Committee and the leadership in the Senate and that there is a deal here. There is a deal that can be made, but we have to have a deadline.

Here is the danger of another long-term CR, another month CR, without having that. We hear that there is a group in the House of Representatives that is controlling the debate over there. They don't represent a majority in the House—far from it. They certainly don't represent the views of the majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate or the American people. But unless we have a deadline now and get this done, we are going to be faced with the same concerns a month from now, and we are not going to be able to get a budget done so that we can deal with the problems of this country.

We should not have a shutdown. All of us should be committed to pass a short-term CR to keep us here and avoid a government shutdown. Everyone loses on a shutdown.

I have the honor of representing one of the largest numbers of Federal employees of any State in the country. Maryland is the proud home to many incredibly important Federal facilities and installations and many talented Federal workers who are on the front-line of public service. They work very hard for the American people every single day. I am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate.

Our Federal workforce has already sacrificed on behalf of our budget. They have gone through too many continuing resolutions that compromise their ability to get the job done. They have gone through too many threats of sequestration, too many pay freezes or pay adjustments that are inadequate, at additional costs to their pensions. They have contributed. What they expect from us is to keep the government open and to give them a budget so that they can get their mission done.

For the sake of our Federal workforce, let's keep the government open.

It is a real hardship if we miss this deadline. It is not without cost. Let me make that clear to my colleagues.

If there is a government shutdown, hard-working Federal workers aren't going to get a paycheck, yet they still have to make their mortgage payments and support their families. Those who are not excepted will go on unpaid leave. That is wrong.

People who depend on Federal contracts in order to keep their businesses going will not have that assurance and will be faced with the prospect of laying off workers.

Individuals who need government services are going to find it much more difficult, if not impossible, to be able to get those Federal services, whether it is tracking down a check they desperately need, getting the type of assistance they need in order to process a concern with the VA, or whether it is a matter of security and they need to contact our government. All of that is going to be put at risk, and the taxpayers of this country will be left holding the bill.

We have gone through government shutdowns before, and we have done analyses each time, and every time it costs the taxpayers more. It costs the taxpayers more.

All of us who are concerned about fiscal responsibility need to find a path forward to make sure we don't shut down the Federal Government. It makes no sense.

I have introduced legislation that I urge my colleagues to make sure we pass. You may be surprised to find out that if we miss the deadline and we go a few days and then we get it done, those Federal workers who are put on furlough will not be paid for our negligence in not keeping the Federal Government open. That is not right. Each time we have corrected that by legislation, but there shouldn't be that uncertainty for the Federal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to pass the legislation I have authored. I have the support of over 20 of my colleagues who have cosponsored this legislation to make sure that our Federal workforce knows they will receive their full compensation.

It is also important that we move forward on getting this budget done and getting work done. If we just take the House's approach and we say "OK, everything is fine," we will be back in 28 days, and we will see this movie again. We have issues that cannot wait to be resolved. We have to resolve these issues.

There are a lot of issues out there, but the one that has gotten a good deal of attention is the Dreamers. This shouldn't be a problem. I agree with some of my colleagues who say: Where is the problem? Well, the problem was created by the President of the United States last September when he set a 6-month deadline on the removal of the Dreamers.

We didn't have a problem until then. We needed to fix our immigration sys-

tem; don't get me wrong. But we didn't have a date on the backs of individuals who know no other country but the United States. As to their shelf life here in the United States, we didn't have that until the President initiated this problem.

When the President did that in September, I applauded colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, who said: Let us come together and fix it in the legislation. We need that, and I agree with that. We should have legislation for the Dreamers, so they have a pathway to citizenship and know that America is their home and their future is here. That should be done.

We had bipartisan legislation ready to go. We were ready to move forward on it, only to find out that while the President said that he was for legislation, he then said: Well, we have to deal with other issues. I have this wall I am concerned about and border security I am concerned about.

So the bipartisan group entered into good-faith negotiations with the President, and they narrowed the issues that needed to be resolved to a few. They talked about border security. They talked about the issues concerning the family and family reunification and dealing with the lottery system on diversity visas. They took up those issues, and they reached a bipartisan agreement as requested by the President and, they thought, with support of the President of the United States. Yes, it does protect the Dreamers, and I am proud to say it also protects those in temporary protected status.

Maryland has a large population from El Salvador and Haiti that are on TPS status. They are all protected under this compromise that was reached. Everybody thought "Oh, my goodness, we have finally resolved this issue; we can go on to the next issue," only to find that the President of the United States flipped his position on it.

I want to be engaged with the President. As the majority leader said, he has to sign bills. I get it. But it is tough to negotiate with someone who tells you one thing on one day and then does the exact opposite on the next day.

We have a responsibility to act. We have a bill that is bipartisan and has enough support to clearly pass the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives. It protects the Dreamers. It protects those with TPS status, and it deals with border security. We need to get that done now also.

We all know we have healthcare extenders that need to be completed in addition to CHIP. CHIP is very important to get done. It should be made permanent, I might tell you. We also have community health centers and many other issues that need to be dealt with in this legislation.

We have disaster relief. We have talked about this many times. We come together as a nation to help those who have been distressed through nat-

ural disasters—the people of Texas and Florida and Puerto Rico and those who have been affected by the wildfires.

Then, of course, the issue I hear the most about is the opioid crisis. We need to make sure that the Federal partnership is strong to deal with this national crisis.

What should we do? Well, let's work together. I must tell you, my constituents, your constituents are not interested in a blame game. They are interested in making sure that their Federal workers have a check to pay their mortgage payments. If they are in need of VA services, they want to make sure those services are available to them. They want to make sure they are getting the best value for their tax dollar, and they want the U.S. Senate and the Congress to work and resolve these issues.

They expect us to pass a budget, and they expect us to deal with these issues. We have a game plan to get all that done in a matter of days if we make the commitment to get it done. That is why I have suggested to the majority leader that there is support for us to stay and get the job done. Keep us in session. Keep government open, and we will get the work done.

Let us come together with a truly bipartisan budget that reflects the will of the American people and the input of all Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives, a budget that makes sense for our Department of Defense, makes sense for those doing the research at the National Institutes of Health, those who are keeping our food safe at FDA, and those who are on the frontlines of the Social Security Administration, handling the issues of our seniors. Let's give them the tools they need in a budget that makes sense for this country.

Let's make sure that we pass these open issues that are urgent, some of which have been created by the President, such as the immigration issues. We have a path forward to resolve those issues now. Let's do that. If we do all of that, then we really are serving the interests of the American people.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that our first responsibility is to the people of this country. Let's not blame each other. Let's stay together and do something that we don't do enough of: Let's listen to each other. Let's get our work done, keep the government open, and do what is right for the American people.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, Chairman HATCH was on the

floor a bit ago talking about the Children's Health Insurance Program. Because his remarks were greatly misleading, I thought it was important—having heard my good friend, my longtime friend, earlier, I thought it was important to come to the floor this afternoon and set the record straight about the Children's Health Insurance Program.

The fact is, the chairman and I did negotiate an important Children's Health Insurance Program extension back in September—bipartisan—and I put in a lot of time, both inside this Congress and outside the Halls of Congress, in order to line up bipartisan support for that effort. And we did, in fact, in the Finance Committee, have near unanimous bipartisan support. That was months and months ago.

The fact is, at that point, the Children's Health Insurance Program could have passed the Congress within days, but unfortunately the Republicans in the other body had some other ideas. From the moment the Senate Finance Committee passed the bill in a bipartisan way, the kids became hostage to the Republican political agenda.

First, the House Republicans tried to force ideological cuts in important health programs, including Medicare, in order to allow this deal to go forward. Then they conditioned helping the vulnerable kids on kicking Americans off their private health insurance. When that didn't work, they took yet another hostage: vaccines and preventive health. For some reason, the other body, the House, wanted to cut off programs that make Americans healthier by preventing disease in the first place. For obvious reasons, Democrats weren't willing to sacrifice that hostage, either.

Now, months after there was a bipartisan deal to finally give peace of mind to these parents and children, the House Republicans have taken yet another hostage. This time, we are talking about the proper functioning of the Federal Government.

The Republicans have been stumbling from one continuing resolution to another continuing resolution since they took power, sacrificing the readiness of the military, impeding the Federal response to natural disasters, and handicapping rural hospitals that don't know when they are going to get paid for the care they provide. We are not going to sacrifice this hostage, either.

The minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, has made a good-faith offer to give the Senate a week to actually come to an agreement to keep the government functioning. I think this makes sense because the cycle of destructive, nakedly political, bad-faith governing can't continue.

What we have is a display of the worst of American politics. The fact is, Republicans control the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. That means that you get to set the agenda, and you get to set the schedule. But Republican leaders

watched and did nothing as the deadline for CHIP funding passed in the fall. So what we had at the end of the year was this picture of how millions of American kids were lower on the list of the Republican priorities than borrowing \$1.5 trillion in order to give additional money to multinational corporations and the political donor class, when the multinational corporations were already awash in cash.

Since the fall, there has been a near constant stream of Republicans appearing on television and in print saying again and again that they are all for the Children's Health Insurance Program—by God, they just want to take care of the kids. The fact is, those Republicans speaking out on television had months to act. They had almost a year. The program expired 111 days ago, and the Finance Committee passed a bipartisan bill that really kicked this all off. I felt very strongly about doing that. The chairman has a long history of working on it, and I wanted to make sure that we were coming right out of the box and getting a strong, bipartisan bill, knowing that perhaps the chairman of the committee would retire. So if there was an up-or-down vote on the Children's Health Insurance Program in the Senate after we moved last fall, it would have gotten 80 votes—probably more—and probably 300 votes in the other body, if that bipartisan measure that came out of the Finance Committee in the fall had had an up-or-down vote. The fact is, the only reason that hasn't happened is the cynical political strategy which I have described that evolved over the months since the Finance Committee acted in a bipartisan way and which has produced this crisis this body faces now.

Even the President, apparently in a moment of unsupervised so-called executive time, said that a long-term CHIP bill ought to move forward unobstructed.

A few weeks ago, the Congress learned—and I made a special push for this because it was clear, as a result of these ill-advised changes that were part of the tax bill, that coverage would be more expensive in the private exchanges and that CHIP would look like an even better investment than it already was. As a result of that information we obtained, it, in fact, saves money to make the Children's Health Insurance Program permanent. Making it permanent, as amazing as it sounds, is a better deal than a 6-year extension and less of an expense for the taxpayers.

True fiscal conservatives, in my view, ought to be tripping over themselves in order to pass a permanent Children's Health Insurance Program without preconditions. Yet, at every turn in this program for the future of so many vulnerable kids—9 million kids—what we saw was not action but Republican leaders taking yet another hostage.

So I want to be clear. I think what we have seen over the last few months

is the exploitation of children by the governing party here in the Nation's Capital. It is wrong. It is causing needless panic among millions of families who are caring for sick kids. This is a crisis made over the last few months by the governing party here in Washington, and it ought to end here, today, with the governing party, the Republicans, releasing the hostage, passing—all of us together—a clean, very short spending bill that would allow this continuing resolution nonsense to end once and for all.

I believe it is in the country's interest to have a permanent extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program. It is an extension that saves the taxpayers money. What you do by making this program permanent is you give more youngsters in America the opportunity for better health, which gives them more opportunity to achieve their full potential in the years ahead.

I will close with this. More than anything else, what I have tried to do is dedicate my time in public service to working in a bipartisan way on healthcare. I have always felt that healthcare was the most important issue. I was director of the senior citizens for almost 7 years. The group was called the Gray Panthers. I ran the legal aid office. I decided then that if you and your loved ones—my good friend, the Presiding Officer, has worked with me and did such good work with us on the veterans bill, another important issue—I always felt that if you and your family didn't have your health, then everything else didn't matter. You couldn't go to the football game. You couldn't find a way to pick up a new skill and have some exciting job options in the future because if you didn't have your health, it went by the board.

Everything I have tried to do in healthcare—everything—I have tried to say ought to be bipartisan. Usually there is a set of options for finding common ground. So often, for example, I felt that my party was right about wanting to expand coverage because if you don't get everybody covered, you have a lot of cost-shifting and not much prevention. I thought Republicans had some valid points, as well, with respect to a role for the private sector.

When it came time to get the Children's Health Insurance Program extended and do it in a bipartisan way, I was very pleased to meet the chairman of our committee, my friend Senator HATCH, in a bipartisan way for a long-term extension with additional funds. That could have been done in the fall. Yet, over the months since then—I have described all of the hurdles, all of the obstacles that Republicans have put in front of making that bipartisan effort, which, as I just indicated, has gotten even more attractive with the new estimates that permanent extensions save money. Republicans have made it harder to take that bipartisan

work, which was part of what I have always thought was the way to do health policy, in the fall and make it law. There is still time to do that. The way we are going to do it is not through the kinds of misleading statements, unfortunately, we heard this morning on the floor. We are going to do it by working in a bipartisan fashion.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING GEORGE BROWN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I try to get down on the Senate floor every week and talk about someone in my State who is making or who has made our State a better place for all of us. It is, actually, one of my favorite parts of the whole week. I know the pages really enjoy it. It is what I call our Alaskan of the Week. It is one of the most fulfilling things that I do.

No doubt, many here in the Chamber and people watching from home and from up in the Gallery have seen pictures or television shows about Alaska. Hopefully, they have been up there. My State has captured the country's imagination. There are cable shows on Alaska, wonderful shows, and for good reason. There is so much about Alaska that is awe-inspiring—our long expanses of tundra, mountain ranges, glaciers, our salmon-filled streams. To everybody watching back home or listening, we want them to go to Alaska if they haven't already been or to go again. It will be the trip of a lifetime. I guarantee you. Yet a State is different from a community. A State is where people go, and a community is where people live. It takes good, strong, and generous people to build a community.

This week, I recognize someone in Alaska who spent his entire adult lifetime building community. His name was George Brown, who, with his wife, Peggy, had run one of the most popular diners—one of the greatest restaurants in Anchorage—since 1955. The Lucky Wishbone is that place that for decades, people from all walks of life have gone—veterans, politicians, oil workers, hospital employees. You name it, they have gone to the Lucky Wishbone. They have converged on this wonderful establishment in Anchorage for some of the best fried chicken and best strawberry shakes ever. I guarantee it if you go. I know from firsthand experience. Trust me.

George Brown was born in rural Wisconsin in 1922. He joined the National Guard at the tender age of 17, and his unit was sent to Alcatraz Island to guard the Golden Gate Bridge. At 21, he had already risen to the rank of master sergeant when he qualified for Officer

Candidate School. In 1943, he finished flight school at Luke Field, AZ, as a second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps. In that same year, George met the love of his life, Peggy, and married soon after.

After he was married, George received orders to fly B-24s across the Himalayas during World War II—a mission in an area famously known simply as the Hump. George earned the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal for his bravery and service during World War II.

Incidentally, the late, great Senator Ted Stevens from Alaska, whose desk I occupy here on the floor, also flew the Hump with the Army Air Corps during World War II, and I know he was a friend of George's.

After the war, George and Peggy and their two children made their way to Alaska to forge a new life. Eventually, that life took shape in a building that George built by hand in downtown Anchorage—the Lucky Wishbone. Its doors opened on November 30, 1955, and a kind of living room for the community—where you could also get great food—was born in Anchorage.

As you know, most walls don't talk, but the walls of the Lucky Wishbone do talk. They are filled with pictures that chart Anchorage and Alaska's history throughout the decades. These photos tell the story of a hardscrabble territory—Alaska—that fought for self-determination and gained citizenship and statehood in 1959. They tell a story of the town of Anchorage, rebuilt after being hit by the most powerful earthquake ever recorded in North America—9.2 on the Richter scale. It lasted for 5 minutes. The walls of the Lucky Wishbone tell the story of a State brimming with excitement when the largest oilfield in North America, Prudhoe Bay, was discovered on the North Slope, and tens of thousands of jobs were created for Alaskans and Americans. They tell the story of the crash in oil prices in the 1980s and of the hard and long recovery. They tell the story about how, through it all, a community and our citizens in Alaska relied on each other.

As all of this history was in the making, George and his wife, Peggy—who by then had four children—went to work every day. They knew their customers by name, and they continued to make the best food in town.

Sadly, Peggy died in 2011 after she and George celebrated 67 years together. George continued to go to work every day. I saw him there. He continued to fly his plane until he was 94 years old—a wonderful, gracious, tough, patriotic Alaskan and a great American.

George passed away earlier this week—an amazing life. He was 96 years old. He left behind two of his four children—Patricia and Corky—lots of grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, and nephews.

The Lucky Wishbone, one of his many legacies, will live on. This great

restaurant has now been passed down to his daughter Patricia and two long-term employees. George and Peggy's memory will also live on with them.

Mr. President, in a few hours, we are likely going to have a simple choice to make here on the Senate floor—to either pass the House's continuing resolution that passed yesterday so as to continue to fund our government and our military and, importantly, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, for 6 years or to shut down the Federal Government. Yet, if you are watching the Senate floor debates about all of this from home or in the Gallery, you might be a bit confused. Actually, I was almost confused last night. Particularly, if you were listening to the minority leader and minority whip's new talking points that they were using last night in their remarks and have been using over the past few days, you might really be confused. Let me give you a little background as to why.

Like the Presiding Officer—actually, more than the Presiding Officer. He has been around the Senate for quite some time. As someone who is relatively new, I sit in that Presiding Officer's chair a lot—as a matter of fact, during the 11 a.m. hour on Wednesdays and Thursdays—so I get to listen to the majority and minority leaders and the majority and minority whips give their opening statements. A couple of times a week, I watch it on C-SPAN—like a lot—and you get to hear the different priorities of the different leaders of the parties. Every day, I hear this. I respect everybody, and I respect our Members on the other side of the aisle, as we all have different areas that we focus on. I will tell you this, rebuilding the military, increasing military readiness, increasing defense funding has not been a key area of focus for the minority leader or minority whip. It is just a fact—not bad or good—just a different priority.

I also sit on the Armed Services Committee and the Veterans Affairs' Committee, and there is a lot that we focus on in those committees, particularly Armed Services, and a lot of us have been concerned about the dramatic cuts in spending. From 2010 to 2016, the military has been cut by 25 percent, even though we have had a dramatic increase in national security challenges.

There is a certain group of Senators, I would say led by the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. MCCAIN, who focus on military issues, military readiness, increasing funding for the troops, who really care about these issues and focus on them daily. I consider myself one of them—a lot of Republicans, some Democrats. The Members of this body know who they are, and we focus on this a lot. Imagine my surprise yesterday and last night when the minority whip and the minority leader started with new talking points emphasizing that this impasse we are

getting ready to see here and the impending possible shutdown is all about their concerns about the military. Their concerns about the military? How the CR was going to hurt the military? Well, with all due respect, that is the first time in 3 years that I have heard the leadership of the other party really emphasize that issue. Again, I have a lot of respect for these men, but they just don't talk about this issue. They don't. That is what they were doing. That is the new talking point. This isn't about something else, it is about our troops.

Well, I think the newest talking points are something that is trying to confuse the American people. Don't be confused by this. These are not the Senators who come out every day and battle for more spending for our troops. These are not the Senators who come down and care about readiness. The new talking points are a little bit hard to swallow.

What was also surprising last night is that the new talking points—how little the minority leader talked about actually the real issue—the real issue, and it is a serious issue. Everybody in this body and everybody in this city knows it is the real issue. Here it is. The other side is saying, unless there is a deal on the DACA issue—which is a serious issue—they will shut down the government. That is the real issue. There is no debating it. It is not about the minority leader's newfound concern about military readiness. That is the issue we are debating.

Now, I think it is a serious issue, the Dreamers. I have met with them. We have about 150 in Alaska. I think we need to help those young men and women. They are great Americans—not Americans yet, but they are great young people. We also need to focus on border security and immigration reform. I certainly want to help them.

Here is the final point. What was missed last night is this talk about—we heard the minority leader saying the CR is going to be bad for the military. A continuing resolution is bad for the military—again, a newfound focus on the military. I hope he joins us as part of the number of Senators who really care and focus on military readiness and defense spending every day, not just last night. What is worse for the military beyond the continuing resolution—and a continuing resolution is bad—but what is worse, there is no doubt about it, the Deputy Secretary of Defense said it today, is a shutdown of the government.

A shutdown of the government really hurts the military. I want to encourage my colleagues, let's not do that. Let's not do that. We will definitely be hurting the military then. Let's get back to work. Let's fund the government. Let's pass this continuing resolution. Let's pass the reauthorization to CHIP, which a lot of my colleagues, in the last several months, have been saying we need to do. I agree. Let's do it tonight. Let's find a resolution for the

border security, DACA, and immigration issues that we can get to a bipartisan agreement on.

What we shouldn't be doing here is coming down with new talking points about how much the minority leader cares about military readiness and military funding, when, to be truthful, that is the first I have heard in 3 years an emphasis in that area. Let's fund the military, certainly. Let's fund the government, but let's not shut down the government tonight. That is not going to help anyone, and it certainly—certainly—is not going to help our troops.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I get into my prepared remarks I want to say, we have been at war for 16 years, and the Senator from Alaska is correct, we do need to rebuild our military. There is no ifs, ands, or buts about it. It is not something that just came about last night. It is something we should have been doing with this budget that should have been passed to go into effect the end of September.

If you really want to talk about the hypocrisy of this body, and there is plenty of it, the fact that we have folks coming to the floor who haven't said a peep about CHIP—it also, by the way, ran out of money the end of September—and talk about how important it is for those kids. By the way, it is very important for those kids. It is the first time we have heard a peep out of them. That is interesting.

The fact is, we do need to come together, and we do need a long-term budget deal. By the way, when I am talking about long term, I am not talking about years and years, I am talking about until the end of September of this year. That is all we have to have is a budget deal to the end of September of this year that addresses more than just CHIP, and CHIP is important. It needs to address our military. It needs to address our southern border security. The chairman knows this. We work together on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security. He understands how important this is.

We have to make sure our borders are secure. We have to make sure we have domestic programs that working families and businesses depend upon in this country, such as CHIP, funding for community health centers, making sure there are dollars there for rural ambulance services.

The list goes on and on.

We have had an incredible failure of leadership here. I think we have had three patches to this budget—three of them. This was supposed to be done 111 days ago. Over 111 days ago, we were supposed to have a budget that lasted for the fiscal year 2018. We were supposed to have a bill that kept services for the U.S. Government open and operating so Montanans and Americans could have the certainty they elected us to create, but for 111 days, the lead-

ership on the other side of the aisle—and I mean intentionally so, I believe—have played politics and kicked the can down the road.

This is not nuclear physics, folks. This is about funding our government. It is not that tough, but we have hit deadline after deadline after deadline, and what we have been told is, look, we will extend about another month or two, and then we will get an agreement. Oh, we will extend out another month, and we will get an agreement.

At Christmastime I was ready to work here through Christmas to get this done because families in this country deserve the certainty of the basic job of setting up a budget. This is the basic job we are elected for in this body. I believe on December 19, once again, we kicked the can down the road, and it was said: You know what, we are going to have a deal by January 19. Well, guess what. It is January 19, and now we are going to move the goal post again.

Each of those previous patches I voted for. Why? Because I believed them. I expected the leaders of this body to work in good faith and get the job done. I was wrong because, for 111 days, they have refused to provide long-term funding for community health centers. For 111 days, they have failed to pass a bill that secures our borders. For 111 days, they have neglected our children by refusing to reauthorize CHIP. For 111 days, they have failed to do the most basic and fundamental aspect of our job; that is, pass a long-term budget that works for this country and works for my home State of Montana.

Now, today we are about 9 hours before the government is set to run out of money. Folks on the other side of the aisle are pointing their finger over here and saying: We have to reauthorize CHIP. If we don't, all these kids—guess what. That same argument could have been made 6 months ago and was not. We have 24,000 kids in Montana who, I am telling you, have been watching. Those families have been watching. They ask: Why? Why hasn't it already been done?

Why are we 111 days after the budget has been passed, and we still have nothing? There is a CHIP bill that has been sitting on the majority leader's desk for many a month to reauthorize CHIP. I believe it has 24 cosponsors on it. There are Members of this body who are not even cosponsors of that bill who have found religion and have come to the floor to passionately talk about CHIP, and we haven't heard crickets from them until the last day or two.

So the folks who have been down here on the floor and on cable television talking about what a great program CHIP is—and it has been a great program. It is one of the first major pieces of legislation I voted on when I was in the Montana Senate. Where have you been? Why haven't we had it on the floor and voted on it? It is important. It is pure hypocrisy. It is what

the Senator from Alaska talked about, only on a different level.

This dysfunction here is way, way, way too deep. This bill also fails to fund community health centers. I will state, I talked to the administrators of the community health centers in places like RiverStone and Flathead, up in Kalispell and Bullock and Havre. I tell you what, these folks are sweating bullets. They are afraid they are going to have to close their facilities down. They provide primary healthcare to 100,000 folks. That may not sound like a lot of people, but in Montana, a State of just over 1 million folks, it is a big deal. These are essential facilities to our communities across Montana. They provide basic healthcare, and they keep families alive. The folks who run these community health centers have told me face-to-face: If we don't get the funding, we are going to have to close the doors.

It has been 111 days, and we should have had a budget to fund community health centers, and we are still standing here today saying: Guess what. When we come back here in February, things are going to be just fine, just like they said in December. I have news for you, nothing is going to change between now and February so let's get a long-term budget deal today that addresses some of these issues.

This bill also fails to make our borders secure. As I said earlier, the Presiding Officer and I have worked on the Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee to draft a bill that works. It invests in a wall where a wall makes sense. It hires more Border Patrol agents. That bill was never brought up to full committee. I am sorry that never happened because it would have been great, and it is not included in the bill before us today.

Time and again, over the last 4 months, good bipartisan bills have been piled up on the leadership's desk. Rather than bring these bipartisan bills to the floor, rather than pass a long-term budget, a more fiscally responsible budget, the Senate has just said: No. Guess what. We will do it next month—and we will do it the month after that and we will do it the month after that.

It is time to stop putting the bandaid on our budget because in 4 weeks we will be back here again if this passes, and it will be the same problems. In fact, we can solve them today, and we need to solve them today. Enough is enough.

Congress has three times passed short-term, stopgap, crisis-funding bills. These bills fail my constituents, and they waste taxpayer dollars. Enough is enough. People are tired of this, and I know they are tired on the other side of the aisle because they have told me. They told me it is time to do our job here. They are as frustrated as I am. They are as frustrated as Montanans are when I meet them face-to-face in townhalls and coffee shops. They tell me it is time for Congress to get off their duff and do their jobs.

Montanans don't run their businesses like this, and our government should not run like this, especially after I hear promises to drain the swamp. This is exactly the opposite. Bringing this garbage bill to the floor is a dereliction of duty. It is incompetent, and mostly it is a failure of leadership. It is a failure of vision.

In any other business in this country, if managers acted like the leadership of this body, they would lose their jobs. It is almost as if the majority had planned this all along to get us to this point for political purposes. Well, guess what, we should not be here for political purposes; we should be here as Americans doing our best to give people the certainty they need rather than playing with a hot potato, saying: You know what, we will do it next month.

We were sent here to govern. We ought to govern and put politics in the closet. We have 9 hours to do a job, and we need to do it. If the majority leadership and the White House are going to continue to sit back and twiddle their thumbs, let's bypass them and let's get a deal. There are good people in this body. We need to sit down and get a deal that works for the rest of this year—that is, until the end of September, not until the 19th of February—that strengthens our borders, reauthorizes CHIP, funds our community health centers, supports rural hospitals, and fixes DACA.

I know there are scores and scores of folks on the other side of the aisle who want to do this. Nobody should leave their desk in this body until this job is done. We are nearly 4 months into this fiscal year. At some point in time, the Appropriations Committee should be starting to work on the 2019 fiscal year budget, but we are not because we can't even get through 2018. We need to stop governing from crisis to crisis. Nobody wants a shutdown, and that is why we need to stay here and do our jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I realized a long time ago something unique and unfortunate about the way Congress can work. It seems sometimes that in Washington, and only in Washington, the more people agree on something, the less likely it is to get done. In the real world, back in Colorado and in Alaska, where the Presiding Officer is from, the more people agree on something, the more likely it is to get done and the more likely you will see progress on an important issue to the people of Colorado and to the people of Alaska. But here in Washington, the more you agree, the more people seem to want to push back to fight and to divide.

So here we are approaching the zero hour of a government shutdown, and I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—where is the good faith, they say. It has been 111 days, and these programs haven't been per-

manently reauthorized? Where is the good faith, they say. They say that we just make it worse by passing a 4-week continuing resolution. Where is the good faith?

Let me just talk a little bit about where we are right now. I have been a part of a bipartisan working group—very proud of the work we are doing—trying to find a solution on a very important issue dealing with many thousands of children around our country and around our State. In Colorado, this issue of DACA, of Dreamers, is incredibly important, not just to part of the State, not just to Denver or the Front Range. Two kids of mine go to school with people who were brought here at a very young age through no fault of their own, and we all agree there needs to be a solution for those kids.

We agree we should address the opiate crisis that is gripping this Nation, that is tearing families apart, and that is resulting in the deaths of far too many people. When you have a crisis that is resulting in the age and life expectancy of Americans declining, like the opiate crisis has, we should address that.

We have men and women in uniform around the country defending this Nation. There are hundreds of thousands in Korea facing down a threat from North Korea. An article in the Wall Street Journal today talked about the special operators who are now in the Philippines directly intervening in the War on Terror in the Philippines, fighting radical Islamic terrorists. Of course we all know about the work that is taking place in the Middle East, the conflict in Syria, the conflict in Iraq, the conflict in Afghanistan, and the progress we have made fighting back on ISIS, fighting back on terrorists, the fact that we have shrunk the ground they have taken. It is one of the great victories people haven't really talked about yet because they would rather talk about divisive issues. And to think that we are hours away from a government shutdown, and somehow people think it is going to make it better. They are going to shut down the government, and somehow that makes it better for the military.

They are willing to shut down the government because they object to a 4-week CR so they can get a 5-day CR or a 3-day continuing resolution. Only in Washington can a bad solution be fixed by a worse solution, but that is exactly what people want to do.

It seems to me that this place ought to get to work, and it doesn't get to work by shutting things down, by going to your partisan corners, picking up your sticks, and going home. Yet that is what some in this body would like to do.

We have a continuing resolution that represents policies that people support. There is not a thing in there that people disagree with that they would vote against—at least that is what we have been told.

In fact, let's look at the CHIP reauthorization. I heard my colleague from

Montana say that this is a garbage bill. A garbage bill that reauthorizes CHIP for 6 years? A garbage bill that will provide healthcare for 8.9 million women and children on SCHIP coverage? This is a garbage bill that provides the longest extension of women and children's healthcare since it was created?

I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Well, they didn't talk about it. They didn't care.

I have been a cosponsor of that bill for months because I believe it is important. It is important to the people of my State.

The fact is, people across this country are tired of the finger-pointing, they are tired of the blame game, and they are tired of the shutdown politics that we are just hours away from seeing played out because people would take this country, this government hostage to the politics of their choice.

I am old enough to remember back in 2013 when President Obama thought a government shutdown was a bad idea, when the Democratic leader believed that a government shutdown could result in governmental chaos, when you shut the government down over the politics of your choice. Yet here we are hours away from people wishing to do just that.

We can find solutions to our Nation's biggest challenges. I am part of a bipartisan working group to work on these solutions, but it makes it more difficult, not less difficult, to find solutions when people shut down the government, and not only that—collateral damage occurs as a result.

There is collateral damage on the men and women across this country who are hurt because of what this government cannot do to help them. We are in one of the most severe flu seasons this country has seen. The CDC has a lot of work to do. If you shut down the government, the CDC can no longer get information from the States about where that flu epidemic is heading, and that makes a difference on where they send vaccines. If you don't vote for this bill to keep the government open, 8.9 million women and children could be affected because of the risk it puts to SCHIP.

Let me talk about a story from my hometown. There are five military bases in the city of Colorado Springs. Here is the headline from a local newspaper: "Potential shutdown would hit hardest at Colorado Springs military bases." There are men and women at Fort Carson, CO, and across Colorado Springs, overseas, deployed on our War on Terror, protecting us at home so we can come to work each and every day so we can have debates on the Senate floor. Some 6,000 civilians are going to be furloughed if this government shutdown occurs. These are civilians who support the War on Terror, who support our men and women in uniform around the globe. Yet, somehow, shutting down the government and furloughing 6,000 civilians is deemed to be

better than a 4-week CR? Only in Washington can people claim that a bad bill should be replaced by a worse bill. Only in Washington can people decide that bad policy shouldn't be preferred over something that is worse, and that is exactly what the argument seems to be. They don't like it, so make it worse. That is not fair to the American people. It is not fair that collateral damage hurts men, women, and children across this country when we can do the right thing and we can bring a solution to our immigration crisis, we can bring a solution to the challenge our military faces, and we can bring a solution to the opiate crisis.

Let me tell you about a business in Fort Collins called Indivior. They have made a breakthrough in the way that treatment is delivered for people who are addicted to opiates. It is a liquid medication, and when it is injected, it solidifies. It is time-released over a month, so it doesn't rely on day-to-day injections. It doesn't rely on a person faithfully taking their medication because if they have a relapse, it can disrupt their medication and what they are doing in their treatment. This takes away that concern and gives them that treatment for a month. That was approved through an FDA emergency expedited review process, but there is legislation that this body needs to pass in order to make sure it is available in a way that will help the American people. Shut down the government, and we can't get that done.

Committees can't meet and the work can't proceed. But I guess that is the solution that people want. I guess shutting down the government seems to be the cure-all for them. Take a hostage, push it off, and somehow that makes it better.

The American people just want us to find an answer. They want us to have good-faith solutions to our problems, and men and women of good faith in this body and the House of Representatives are trying each and every day to do that. But don't prove to the American people their worse suspicions that Washington doesn't care. Pass the continuing resolution. Continue negotiations. We have time to talk. We have time to communicate. We have time to work. Stop the temper tantrums. The American people deserve better.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, as I come to the floor today, we are facing the prospect of a government shutdown. At midnight tonight, funding runs out, the lights will go dark, and when that happens, everyone suffers. No one wins; everyone suffers. I know that, and you know that. Republicans know that, and we have offered a solution that keeps the government open and extends the Children's Health Insurance Program. As a doctor, I will tell you how valuable that program is for children all across the country.

The House has already passed this legislation. Democrats in the Senate

have promised to block it, to stand in the way. Some have actually been bragging that they can shut down the government and that they want to shut down the government. Why would someone want to do that? Well, here is what the New York Times said on its front page this morning: "Senate Shutdown Looms As Spending Bill Advances. House approves a stopgap measure while Democrats dig in on immigration." That is the reason the Democrats want to shut down the government of this entire country—over the issue of immigration. That is the New York Times. Here is the Washington Post this morning: "Shutdown looms despite House action. Democrats tie 'dreamers' to passage of budget deal."

There it is—the New York Times and the Washington Post. The minority leader is forcing a shutdown over the issue of illegal immigration. Democrats are ready to set aside all other issues, all other deadlines, all other priorities.

Republicans have written and passed legislation that funds the government. That means funding for our military, funding for our veterans. It means funding for opioid treatment. It means funding for everything that our Federal Government does now, and it funds the Children's Health Insurance Program—not just for a week or a month, it funds it for the next 6 years. This is a program that helped provide medical care for almost 9 million children and needy families across this country. There are more than 7,300 people in my home State of Wyoming who benefit from this program. The money for this program is going to start running out in some places very soon. The funding has been in limbo since last fall. Some States are getting ready to send letters to families—letters that tell those families their coverage is going to be discontinued because this Senate didn't act.

States have been asking for certainty, and that is what we are doing with this legislation. We are providing that certainty. We are taking care of this program, which is so vital to families across every State in this country, for the next 6 years. Democrats are blocking it. It does seem to be that what they really want to do is make a political point at the expense of everything else and everyone else. They are willing to hold 9 million children and their families hostage to do it. They are willing to hold hostage more than 300 million Americans who could be harmed by a prolonged government shutdown. And it is all over the immigration issue, as they talk about in the Washington Post and the New York Times, an issue known as DACA, which stands for "deferred action for childhood arrivals." It was intended as a temporary program to deal with the problem of people who were brought to this country illegally when they were just young children. The program was set up by an Executive action by President Obama. It wasn't done by law. It

wasn't a bipartisan program. It was a Democratic President acting on his own to kick the can down the road on this issue.

These issues related to immigration—and specifically illegal immigration—are very tough, and we need to keep working toward a solution. There are discussions going on every day within the Senate—Republican and Democrat—between the House and the Senate. Why do people want to risk blowing up these discussions?

Well, it seems that whatever we agree to needs to include important matters of border security because, to me, border security is national security, and that has to be included in that discussion and deliberation. Any solution is going to have to include real fixes to our broken immigration system so that we are not just having the same argument again in a couple of years.

I think coming up with a solution like this does continue to take time. Certainly, it is not something we can do by midnight tonight. There is not even a good reason we need to rush to solve this problem in a few hours. The fact is, no current DACA recipients are going to lose their benefits under the program for 6 months.

Democrats are setting an arbitrary deadline of midnight tonight, and they are threatening to shut down the government if their deadline is not met. The legislation Republicans have offered takes care of one emergency, and it gives negotiators time to reach consensus on this separate and unrelated subject.

The continuing resolution already passed by the House provides certainty to the Children's Health Insurance Program, and it allows us the chance to work out some certainty on the DACA issue.

Some Democrats are saying that they refuse to do that. Well, it is interesting because in 2013, the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, thought that a government shutdown at that time was a terrible idea. He said:

No matter how strongly one feels about an issue, you shouldn't hold millions of people hostage. . . . That's wrong, and we can't give in to that.

He even spelled out the exact situation we are facing today. He did it not just on the Senate floor; he did it on television in 2013. On ABC's "This Week," October 6, 2013, he said:

We believe strongly in immigration reform. We could say, "we're shutting down the government, we're not gonna raise the debt ceiling, until you pass immigration reform." It would be governmental chaos.

He is right. It would be governmental chaos. That is what Senator SCHUMER said in 2013. Now he is trying to create exactly that same governmental chaos that he described back then. It is for the exact same reason that he talked about in 2013—the exact same reason that the Washington Post cites as the reason on today's front page: "Democrats tie 'dreamers' to passage of bud-

get deal." In the New York Times: "Democrats dig in on immigration."

What is different now is that Democrats have decided to stake all of their political hopes on this one issue. They are holding America hostage to do it.

Nobody benefits from the Democrats shutting down the government. Nobody benefits from the game the Democrats are playing with the security and the safety of American families. To me, it is irresponsible for them to seek this shutdown over their agenda on this issue of immigration.

We should pass the resolution that we have before us today. It is time for Democrats to step back from the damage this shutdown will cause to children, to our military, to our veterans, to our economy, and return to the table to discuss the issues in which they are focused.

I would recommend to my colleagues across the aisle that they follow the advice from Senator SCHUMER in 2013: Don't play politics with people's lives and create "governmental chaos."

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to talk about why we are here, but I will just begin with a definitive statement: There is not one of the 49 Democrats in this Chamber who wants the government to shut down. And I will conclude with this, but I will just state that if the government of the United States shuts down, it is for one reason and one reason only, and that is that the majority leadership does not want to work weekends. I will come back to that in a minute.

Why are we here? We are here debating on a House continuing resolution drafted without Democratic support or consultation at the eleventh hour and sent over to us on the last day of a spending authorization period.

Most folks in the Chamber know—but those watching on television may not—we were supposed to have a budget and an appropriations bill by October 1. That did not happen. So the leadership suggested that we agree to work and find an appropriations bill and a budget by December 8. That didn't happen. Then there was the suggestion that we delay until December 22, and that didn't happen. Then there was a vote on December 22 to delay until January 19—today. Apparently, that is not going to happen.

The request today is that we pass a continuing resolution that would put this matter to the 16th of February, and we would then be in the fifth month of the fiscal year without a budget deal. Why would we want to do that? What we should want to do is not budget by continuing resolution, but actually do a budget deal.

For folks who aren't schooled in the insider phrases we use, a continuing resolution is like driving your car looking in the rearview mirror. We ought to be driving our car looking

through the windshield—look forward with a budget that looks forward—but a continuing resolution is: Well, we are unwilling or unable to make a decision, so let's just do what we did yesterday. That is no way to operate the government of the greatest country on Earth.

What we need to be about is finding a final budget deal. What is wrong with continuing resolutions? I think a pivotal moment in this discussion—as we are sort of looking at how it has developed—occurred about 8 days ago. I am on the Armed Services Committee. I am the father of a U.S. Marine. The Secretary of Defense, General Mattis, came to talk to both the Democratic caucus and the Republican caucus lunches.

I don't know what he said to the Republican lunch, but I know what he said to us. The Secretary looked us in the eye—this was, I think, on January 8—and said: Do not give me another continuing resolution. The pattern of continuing resolutions has hurt the Nation's defense. Do not give me another continuing resolution.

When the Secretary of Defense looks at us and tells us that, I take that seriously.

Yesterday, we had an Armed Services hearing, and four Trump administration nominees for key positions dealing with research, acquisitions, installations, and energy were before us. Because they each have experience working with the DOD or other Federal agencies, I asked each of them: What do you think of continuing resolutions?

To a person, these men and women said: They are horrible. We shouldn't live under continuing resolutions. Don't do them. Do a budget.

When they were done testifying, I said: The interesting thing is that you are actually here on the day when the House is going to be voting on a continuing resolution that is directly contrary to what Secretary Mattis asked of us and what you are testifying to today.

Last night, as we were on the floor awaiting the House message to come over with the continuing resolution, the Pentagon's chief spokesperson tweeted: Continuing resolutions are wasteful, and they hurt the military. Don't do another continuing resolution. We need a full budget for 2018.

This morning, Secretary Mattis spoke, giving a national security speech, and he was asked about this budgetary debate. He said: "The value of the American military is grossly enhanced by the sense that the American model of government, of the people, by the people, for the people, can function and carry out its governmental responsibilities." He continues to say that the right thing for our troops is to do a full budget, not a continuing resolution.

So to hear my colleagues stand up and say that the Democrats want to shut government down: No, we don't. We want to do what the Secretary of Defense said we should do.

We want to do what a veteran told me yesterday in Arlington. I had a veterans' roundtable. I was listening to their concerns about VA and mental health—issues we care about. One veteran said: I am a veteran, but I want to talk to you about being a Federal employee. I am a Federal employee in civilian service. I live in Quantico. Don't make us live under continuing continuations. The uncertainty of it is just too great. Find a final budget deal.

That is the task that is really before us right now, on January 19. Can we find a final budget deal? What should we do? It is not that hard. The deadline tonight is completely artificial. There is nothing magic about January 19.

What we should do is commit, as Senators and House Members, to stay here and get a final budget deal done. There are a series of discrete items. There are the budgetary numbers for defense and other important priorities—healthcare, education, transportation, mental health. There are emergency relief packages for the hurricanes and wildfires of the last few months. Those are important.

There are a number of healthcare priorities like the CHIP program. That is important.

I would argue that a resolution of the issue with Dreamers is important. Why do I say it is important? Because President Trump told us to do it in September. He said: I am going to end the Dreamer program in 6 months. I will end DACA in 6 months. I disagreed with that, but what I did agree with was when he said that this was for Congress to fix. He put a burden on our shoulders to fix it in September.

It is 5 months later, and there is a bipartisan proposal on the table. President Trump said: Send me a proposal, and I am going to sign it. You work it out, and I am going to sign it.

We now have a proposal that I believe is ready to be voted on and, I believe, would pass in both bodies.

What we should do is avoid the short term—avoid the continuing resolutions that the Secretary of Defense has told us not to pass, follow his advice and stay here at the table over the weekend and into next week, and find a final budget deal. That is how we can best serve our constituents.

I think there is only one person who has talked about shutdown with glee and with interest that it happen—the President. This is a tweet from May: "Our country needs a good 'shutdown.'"

I remember the tweet well because I am on the Budget Committee, and we were having budget hearings then. We had a Trump administration nominee before us for a key position—OMB, I believe. I asked him: Do you think there is such a thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government? I have been asking that question to many witnesses before the committee. Most say: No, there is in never such a thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government. That is what we believe, and I

think that is what our Republican colleagues believe. There is no such thing as a good shutdown of the U.S. Government. We all believe that.

In this instance, we don't even need to entertain the thought. If we are willing to stay over the course of the next few days to try to do what Secretary Mattis asked and find a final budget deal, I believe we can find one, especially if the President were to say: Congress, stay at your job. Find a final budget deal. It has to be bipartisan, and I will support it. If the President were to say those things, we could find a deal. That would be the best thing for all concerned.

Instead of kicking it down the road for a month, we might have to say that we are going to kick it down for 3 days or 4 days or 5 days while we negotiate. Let's put the pressure on to negotiate and not do this month-long extension that we have done since October 1, which has gotten us nowhere.

That is what I meant when I said that the only reason this government would shut down over this is if the leadership decides they don't want to work on weekends. Federal employees work on weekends. Go out to Dulles and look at TSA employees doing their jobs as people are traveling around. A whole lot of folks who are my constituents in Virginia, our neighbors in Richmond, work on weekends. I know my Senate colleagues work hard in their districts. We work on weekends.

We can work on weekends here. We can scrap some plans for the weekend. We can commit to finding a final budget deal that would meet what Secretary Mattis asked us to do. We should do that.

No one wants to shut this government down. There is only one person who has been talking about it with glee. But even today, when President Trump asked Senator SCHUMER to come and have a dialogue, I think that was a tacit admission that he now realizes it would be a bad idea. If it is a bad idea, let's just stay here and get a budget deal done. That is what the folks sent us here to do, and I know we can do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, I rise today to discuss two important issues: keeping our government running and protecting an important tool in the fight against the opioid epidemic. I know how strong the Presiding Officer is on that as well.

Today we face a deadline to fund the government. It is the most basic duty of Congress to keep our government running.

I was elected by the people of Indiana to work every day on behalf of Hoosiers to do my job as a U.S. Senator. Keeping the government running is our job, and I will vote to keep the government open.

I hope that Republicans and Democrats will join together to reach an

agreement that avoids a shutdown. We still have that opportunity to prevent a shutdown. I stand ready to work with anyone.

I share the frustration of many Hoosiers and Americans. We have been down this road before, but Congress does not need to follow that path again.

As a potential shutdown looms, the President's opioid public health emergency declaration is on the verge of expiring. According to reports today, the administration is planning to cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent. Let me say that again. The President's opioid public health emergency declaration is on the verge of expiring, and according to reports today, the administration is planning to cut the Office of National Drug Control Policy by 95 percent.

ONDCP coordinates Federal efforts to combat opioid abuse and heroin use, as well as drug trafficking in Indiana and across the country. In addition, ONDCP administers the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Program, or HIDTA, which supports and enhances cooperation between Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to combat drug trafficking. It is a program that effectively brings together critical law enforcement partners in Indiana, and the reported cuts to ONDCP could upend the good progress that is being made.

As we work to confront the opioid crisis, we should be investing in critical tools for Hoosier law enforcement and communities to combat drug abuse and trafficking. This is a crisis. It is not a time for the Federal Government to take critical tools for Hoosiers communities off the table. We should be doubling down on effective efforts. We must confront the opioid epidemic with all possible tools available and everyone working together to address this public health emergency.

I yield back.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, we are here to talk a little bit about immigration reform and maybe a little bit about the looming government shutdown. I want to start with the government shutdown because it is intrinsically linked with some of the arguments that are being made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

What we are trying to do is fairly simple. We are trying to fund our servicemembers. We are trying to fund our veterans. We want to get a long-term authorization for the CHIP program. The CHIP program actually expired last year, but there were sufficient funds on account to continue funding, but they are running out. In States like North Carolina and other States, this program is going to start being

shut down if we don't get much needed resources. We are talking about a multiyear reauthorization for the plan and, of course, continuing to fund the National Institutes of Health, which is a critically important part of combating diseases, finding treatments, and cures. That is all we are trying to do with this spending bill.

The other thing we are trying to do is create a bridge for a month so we can get our colleagues on both sides of the aisle talking and hopefully get some certainty in terms of funding going into next year—if it were up to me and I think up to Senator LANKFORD, for several years, but it would be good to get some long-term certainty in the funding process because right now these continuing resolutions are killing us. We are living paycheck to paycheck. It creates all kinds of inefficient processes. It is wasting taxpayer dollars.

We have to at least start with funding the government tonight. At midnight tonight, if we don't act on a continuing resolution, then we will be shutting down the government. I, for one, am going to vote for the continuing resolution like I have every resolution for the last 3 years I have been here because I believe we need to pay our bills. I believe we need to fund our servicemembers. I believe the civilian employees should know they can come back to work on Monday, and we need to do a better job of actually getting together and coming up with centered solutions that gain enough support on both sides of the aisle to do that.

Now I want to talk about why we are at the shutdown. We are mainly at the shutdown because some Members want to put all of our government funding at risk—all the funding I was talking about here at risk—because we have not yet reached an agreement on immigration reform.

Senator LANKFORD and I have spent a lot of time on this. In September of last year, we introduced the SUCCEED Act, which was an honest effort to get into the discussion on how we could come up with a long-term solution for the DACA population. We got together with Senator DURBIN, Senator GRAHAM, and a number of other Members to try and negotiate out our differences. We made some progress.

Now I will bring you forward to a couple of weeks ago. We met with the President 2 weeks ago, on a Thursday. Republican Members—it included myself, Senator LANKFORD, and other Members, and we told the President we thought we were making progress. Senator GRAHAM was in the meeting as well. But we thought to really get the deal done, we needed a bicameral, bipartisan meeting. The President thought it was a good idea, and he hosted the first meeting that following Tuesday. That meeting—actually, the majority of it, about 55 minutes of it—was televised. People could see the discussion going on. Actually, people saw

a lot of good interchange. There were clearly gaps, but we thought we were making progress. What we agreed in that meeting was that there were four main pillars of this first phase of immigration reform.

The idea of comprehensive immigration reform sounds good, except it has failed every time they attempted it. We decided we should start with a more focused effort to address some of the border security concerns and certainty for the DACA population. It sounded like a good idea, so we decided we would have the No. 2 leaders in the House and the Senate—the Democrats and Republicans, four people—get together the following day and develop a schedule so a subset of that group of a couple of dozen people who met with the President could get together and work out our differences.

Senator LANKFORD and I knew going into it that in order to compromise, we were going to have to accept positions that were short of what we wanted, but that is the whole purpose of compromising. Nobody gets everything they want. We were looking forward to what we would hope would be a schedule coming out from the whips—the Democrats and the Republicans, the four who were in the meeting—and that never happened. What we instead found out was on Thursday, a subset of the group, without talking with any of us, decided to have a meeting with the President and see if they could offer their solution. That is what a lot of them have been talking about on the floor. They are saying: Our solution is ready to go. We can put it in the year-end spending bill. We have bipartisan support. We can let it go.

Last night, I finally got the full text of their solution. I want to share it with you. There it is. It is a title. It is nothing. There are no specific provisions. There is not a bill filed. There is no evidence they have spoken with people to try to bridge the gaps. It is completely counter to what we agreed to do that Tuesday, a week or so ago.

I am asking my colleagues to recognize that people like I and Senator LANKFORD care about the DACA population. We want to provide them with certainty. We also want to make sure we put balance into the proposal so we are not here again 10 years from now, so we can make sure we have something of enduring value. We don't want to do something quick, where maybe you play gotcha and you put some pressure on someone and you get a bill because those sorts of bills are always at risk of being reversed.

We have already taken hits in our States. There are people who think we never should have had this discussion, but we care about the DACA population. We care about border security. We care about Homeland Security and a number of the things that have to go together so we provide a solution, but then we also make sure it is highly unlikely that Senators 10, 12, 15 years from now are in the same place.

Before I turn it over to Senator LANKFORD, I want to talk a little bit about why border security should be argued on compassionate grounds. I was in Texas in February. I spent a week there with Senator CORNYN and some of the other Members. I was all along the border. I met with Border Patrol agents. Some of them had been shot at. They had stories about some of their colleagues who had been killed. I was in Laredo where they showed me the door of a helicopter that had just been shot through a couple of weeks earlier by someone across the Rio Grande in what they call Nuevo Laredo. It is a dangerous place down there.

There is a compassionate basis for trying to keep our border security and CIS agents safe. There is also a compassionate case for knowing who is crossing the border and where they are. Why? Because 10,000 people have died crossing that border over the last 20 years. Almost 1,000 of them were kids or minors. That doesn't include the number who get killed or die long before they ever get to the southern border.

The way it works is they have these human traffickers, or human smugglers, who charge thousands of dollars to get somebody across the border. Sometimes they get across; oftentimes they don't. It is a moneymaker. As a matter of fact, the cartels that run the different plazas—that is the geographies along the southern border. It is sort of like if you go through this plaza, you better be paying a toll or you are probably going to die. We have one example where 72 people were all murdered, one family—men, women, and children—because the person who was smuggling them apparently got crosswise with the cartel. So to send a message, they killed these people. They died because we didn't know they were there. We didn't know they crossed the border. We didn't have the situational awareness that we are trying to get done with the border security provisions that are in a compromise bill that we offered.

I can also talk about the millions of doses of drugs that cross our border every week. Every week millions of doses of poison cross our border. We talk about the opioid epidemic, and we know a vast majority of the opioids—the heroin, the fentanyl, the variants of opioids that are coming across the border—are coming from south of the border, either by water or by land. If that is not a compelling case, a compassionate case, for American border security with what we are trying to do with immigration reform, I don't know what is. We are not talking about a wall. We are not talking about a 2,300-mile wall.

I have been criticized for several years because I sit on the Judiciary Committee. We have had a number of hearings that would have never made sense. The President has been briefed by Border Patrol. He understands it is

a series of structures, people, technology. Infrastructure is what border security call it. We are asking for the baseline funding and build it out over time—walls where it makes sense, fences and roads, reconnaissance, and just intelligence-gathering devices in some places. That is all we are asking for. There is a deal to be struck here very quickly, but you don't do it by going around a process that, 2 days before, you agreed to participate in.

I thank Senator LANKFORD because Senator LANKFORD has done an extraordinary job. I also want to thank our staffs because they have done an amazing amount of work to really come up with something that had been well received, to a certain extent, by Senator DURBIN and others. In fact, they embraced some of the provisions, but then things just broke down because all they wanted to talk about was the DACA component. They didn't want to talk about the other things that make it an enduring and impactful and compassionate solution for which, I think, we could easily get 60 votes.

I would appreciate Senator LANKFORD's thoughts and comments on this.

I yield the floor to Senator LANKFORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, Senator TILLIS and I have come to the floor today because we have just some incredible frustration and wanted to be able to bring some facts to this conversation.

I absolutely grieve for the Federal workers in my State. I mean, there are some phenomenal people who do an amazing job. Most people will never know their names, but, every day, they are getting up to serve the American people.

Every day, there are folks who are in our military who are serving the American people. The civilians who surround them, though they are not listed as Federal employees, are intimately connected to what we are doing for the Federal task—for people. They are trying to figure out this afternoon what is going to happen to them this weekend and next week. They are frantically getting together in offices all over Oklahoma and, quite frankly, all over America and are trying to piece together the “now whats?” of a government shutdown, which is distracting them from getting all of the things done that they already need to get done that they are backlogged on now. For what?

The frustration of this whole focus on “let's do a government shutdown over not having to have real discussions about DACA and immigration” is not only not accurate, but it is also something that is already in the process that is somehow being short-circuited. All of these Federal workers and all of these civilian employees who are going through all of this turmoil in

trying to figure out why DACA is not resolved and why the deadline for DACA is in the first week of March, yet it forces them to be out and have all of this chaos now, at the end of January, has brought utter confusion to everyone, especially when you know the history of this dialogue. Let me walk everyone backward through a span of a few months here.

In September, the Nation was surprised when President Trump announced that he was not going to renew DACA and that he wanted a legislative, long-term fix for DACA. The very day that he made that announcement, I released a statement, saying: In America, we do not hold children accountable for the acts of their parents. We don't do that in American law.

Just a couple of days after that, the President called me late one night. He said: Hey, I saw your statement in a report about that. Can we talk about it? We spent about 20 minutes late that evening just talking about immigration policy and his interest in getting a legislative, long-term resolution for DACA, for these kids who have to renew every 2 or 3 years, and they have no idea what is going to happen. He wanted to have some semblance of permanence for them but, at the same time, also resolve some of the issues around border security that were not controversial a few years ago. He said that we need to deal with some issues with border security, and we need to deal with the issue of DACA and give them some semblance of permanence. Can we put this together?

Actually, at that time, Senator TILLIS and I were already working to get something together because, for the last 15 years, the DREAM Act has come up before the House and the Senate, and for 15 years, it has failed every single time. The DREAM Act failed when there was a Democratic President, a Democratic Senate, and a Democratic House of Representatives. That bill was not going to pass. We knew that, so we went to work, asking: What is a better solution that will provide some semblance of permanence on this?

Our conversation was about a lot of the pushback as to why the DREAM Act had not passed in the past. A lot of Americans feel like: I understand this group of individuals has grown up in our country, pledges allegiance to our flag, speaks English, is passionate about where they live, that this feels like home to them, but it is not home. They wanted them to be able to have that opportunity, but they didn't want them to be able to cut in line.

So we put in a process to say that here is a way those individuals can earn the right to be naturalized citizens of the United States, but they have to earn it through a process, just as someone who is international would have to go through that process to be here. The exception would be they are already here, and they wouldn't have what DACA provided. DACA provided 2

years of “we will not arrest you” but no legal status. This would provide immediate legal status and an opportunity after 10 years to be able to earn naturalization. That had never been offered like that before.

We worked through all of the details of that and laid out a proposal and said: This is a section of a larger bill. We feel that this is a way to get past what has blocked the DREAM Act year after year after year and what has been the biggest frustration for many of the people in the country with the DREAM Act. Yet our caveat was very consistent. We wanted to be able to resolve this, but it had to be resolved with border security attached to it.

I didn't think that was an unreasonable request. I was surprised to hear that it might have been since, in the previous Gang of 8 versions several years ago that had come out of the Senate, there had been a large section in it about border security. I assumed this would be a nonissue to be able to pair those issues together. It seems irresponsible to deal with the DACA issue and to not address: How did that happen in the first place? To say that we have a secure border and that we don't need to address anything would be to ignore 12 million examples in our country of that rule being violated either through visa overstay or through individuals coming across the border who want to be in our country but who have crossed illegally instead of through a legal process.

We are a very open, receiving country. Every day, a half a million people cross our southern border legally—a half a million every day. A million people a year legally become citizens of the United States. We are not a country that is anti-immigration. We just want it done the right way. We think the law should apply to everyone equally all the time and don't like anyone circumventing the law.

So here is a history lesson.

On September 5, the President makes that announcement. Within days, we have conversations with the President about it. He agrees we need to be able to have something that is a long-term solution for border security and for DACA. Within about 2 weeks, Senator TILLIS and I release the SUCCEED Act and say this has to be part of our border security. Thankfully, in our conference, at the same time, Senator CORNYN is also working through border security to be able to partner it with this. At the same time, Senator COTTON and Senator PERDUE are also working on other areas dealing with chain migration, knowing these could all be partnered together to be able to put into a final bill. They were individual titles of a larger proposal. We were bringing those out.

In October, the President of the United States released a long report, saying here is what he would like to have in a bill. He put great detail into it and said that this is what he expects the bill to be like when it is resolved.

So now it is October. He said that we have to get this resolved. We release three different bills, and the President releases something. We want to start negotiations.

In November, we are in negotiations in a bipartisan group, and every day in the bipartisan group, all that our Democratic colleagues want to talk about is DACA—every day. Our staffs meet every day. We are meeting every other day as Members, going through this—sometimes every day going through it. Every day, it is DACA, and, every day, we bring up: Hey, there are other aspects of this that we have agreed to. Yet, every day, they say: Well, let's work on DACA some more.

It finally hits a point in December that I ask: When are we going to get to talking about border security? We have to talk about that. Well, guess what happened. The next meeting I was not invited to attend. Neither was I invited to the next one. Neither was Senator TILLIS. Our staffs find out they are still meeting and contact them and say: Hey, we are still interested in getting to a bipartisan agreement. They do not respond to our staffs' emails. They will not even tell us when or where they are meeting.

We didn't walk away from the negotiations. We were kicked out of the negotiations because we believed that this deal needed to have border security in it and DACA. For a group that said, basically, we don't want to deal with border security, they were no longer interested in us, which took us to a stalemate of really getting this resolved, which took us to 2 weeks ago.

On Tuesday, the President invites us over in a bipartisan, bicameral conversation to say: We have to get a plan here. This is stuck. During that meeting with the President, with 26 House Members and Senators together from both parties, we make an agreement that there will be four areas of this final agreement and that these will be the negotiators to be able to pull it together—the Republican and Democratic whips from both the House and the Senate. Those four individuals will be the individuals to pull it together, and they are going to get that done. That was on Tuesday.

By Thursday of that week, a smaller subgroup of the group that I had been kicked out of went back to the President and said: No. We have a better idea. Let's try to do this instead. I know, on Tuesday, we agreed to the other process, but we have another idea to kind of end-run that whole process.

Clearly, it upset a lot of us to say that we are trying to do a bipartisan deal, that we are trying to work this through the process, that we are trying to be of good faith in this. So far, there have not been good faith negotiations on border security at all. We cannot deal with the issue of individuals who are in our country illegally, even if we as Americans see them as neighbors and friends and future citizens of our country, and ignore how it happened in

the first place. That would not be responsible of us.

Now, there are some who want to say, "This is because you are just, simply, a racist," which is infuriating and inaccurate and belittles the conversation. To stand up and say that the only reason you think this is because you are a racist is trying to shut down the conversation, not engage in it. These are my friends and neighbors as well, but we are legislators, and we have a responsibility to solve issues, not to belittle each other and not to make false accusations.

There are millions of people who have crossed our border to be able to work or connect with family. I fully understand that. Many of them live around my place, go to church with me. I get that completely. There are also many people who cross our borders because of crime, and we would be foolish to ignore that reality as well. There are people who cross that border to be able to traffic drugs, to be able to traffic in terrorism, to be able to move people—human trafficking, labor trafficking. We should have a secure border set up for that.

Again, this used to not be a partisan issue. In 2006, Senator SCHUMER and, at that time, Senator Obama voted for the Secure Fence Act, which put in 650 miles of fencing on the southern border. Let me say that again. Senator SCHUMER and Senator Obama and a lot of other Democratic Senators, who are still here, voted for the Secure Fence Act in 2006 to put in 650 miles of fencing on our southern border. This didn't used to be a partisan issue, and it shouldn't be today. Border security is not partisan. It is national security.

The proposals that have come out at times amaze me. Let's actually get serious about trying to resolve these issues. Basic border security issues should involve not just some fencing in some areas or walls in some areas or technology in some other areas or adding additional manpower in other areas. Those are reasonable things along our border that every country in the world has organized.

It also involves dealing with some of the gaps in our law if someone crosses into the United States. These are things that need to be addressed—for instance, the removal of multiple felony criminal illegal aliens. Why is this controversial? This shouldn't be a controversial issue at all, but for some reason, it is. To end the practice with greater fines and penalties for people who smuggle in people for profit, why would that be controversial? For some reason, it is.

We are dealing with additional judges because we have 600,000 people in a backlog in our immigration courts—600,000 people in our immigration courts in a backlog. Why would that be controversial to have to deal with a backlog? We are behind on family members who have petitioned to be a part of this country but who were—get this—20 years in a backlog. Why would

that be controversial to say that we need to divert some of our attention to catching up on the backlog?

There are a lot of issues that we need to deal with, and this is a complicated issue. But for other Members, can I just say that we are very close to negotiating this, that people have actually acted in good faith in negotiations. But saying "We will shut down the government until you do it our way"—and their way was an end run around the whole stated process that we all agreed on—seems absurd to me, and it certainly seems absurd to the Federal workers in my State who are now going through chaos this afternoon because some people wanted to make an end run around the process that was already in place.

Let's finish the process and not create some artificial cliff and chaos to try to say "Do it my way, or I will shut down the government." Let's finish the process. There are willing partners on both sides, and there are reasonable proposals to finish out what we have already started and worked on for months to get through this process.

I thank Senator TILLIS for the engagement he has on this because he and his team have worked exceptionally hard. My team and I, both in my State and here, have worked exceptionally hard on these issues, and we want to get them right. Senator CORNYN and his team have worked exceptionally hard on these issues.

Let's do it, and let's get it right, but let's not shut down the government while in the middle of negotiations because people want to have it their way and not actually finish the negotiations we started.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I am pleased to see Senator CORNYN here. He has done an extraordinary job. As a matter of fact, it was Senator CORNYN who hosted the trip that I made down to the border that gave me an incredibly important perspective on the case for border security. I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

I want to leave a final comment for the DACA population. Some people say: What is the crisis? We have until March 5.

I understand that every single day you wake up, that day seems like today. I know we need to move more quickly. Quite honestly, we could have gotten this done a couple of months ago if people had engaged, recognized their differences, and accepted a compromise. We are doing everything we can to get done much sooner than March 5 because we understand that they are our teachers, our EMTs. There are 900 serving in the military. They are hard-working people. They are kids in school. There are hundreds of thousands of good people—in a proposal that we put together, over a million—that we want to welcome into this Nation because they are great citizens, they love this country, they are productive citizens, and I want them to

know that we know that. I want them to know that there are dozens of Republicans prepared to vote on a compromise bill that is balanced, that brings border security and provides certainty to the DACA population. We are going to do everything we can every day that we are here to make sure that we deliver on that promise.

Madam President, thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, let me say publicly what I have said privately to Senator TILLIS and Senator LANKFORD.

Thank you for your leadership.

They have done an extraordinary job trying to come up with a solution to the issue, the problem, the challenge that they have already described. I would like to add a little color to some of that, but they have done extraordinary work to try to come up with a compassionate but legal framework by which we can resolve this issue.

I have been in the Senate since 2002, and I have been through the immigration wars more times than I care to count. We keep working very hard on this issue, and we always seem to come up short. I come from a State that is one of the most diverse States ethnically in the country, and that is because we have been a big job creator, and a lot of people have been moving there looking for opportunities. We have a large Hispanic population. It makes sense. We are Texas, after all—used to be a part of Mexico. About 38 percent of my constituents are Hispanic, and I know that is a large part of the population we are looking at when it comes to the Dreamers. There are about 124,000 Dreamers in my State and others who are eligible who, frankly, are in a little bit of a box, not knowing how to deal with their situation.

When I think about immigration, I think about the two great pillars that have made our country great. No. 1, we are a nation of immigrants. We have benefited from the fact that people have fled religious persecution. They have fled poverty. They have come to the United States to experience the sort of freedom that our country has guaranteed to each and every one of us and the opportunity to pursue the American dream. That, to me, is one of the great things that have made our country the envy of the world. The other part and the part that I think sometimes people tend to overlook and forget is, what makes America great? We are a nation of laws. We are a nation of immigrants, and we are a nation of laws. When we forget either one of those pillars, I think we risk damaging this wonderful inheritance that we have gotten from our parents and grandparents and people who have gone before us.

I view this responsibility that we all share together here in the Congress as a sacred trust. We are the stewards of

that inheritance. Shame on us if we don't do everything within our power to pass that on to the next generation and beyond.

By way of a little bit of background, I think sometimes people get—it is just natural. We become familiar with these terms like “DACA.” People may be listening on TV, saying: What in the heck is DACA?

We say: That is a easy. It is deferred action for childhood arrivals.

They ask: What is that?

We say: We are talking about the Dreamers.

That is what Senator DURBIN and others have talked about because there is something called the Dream Act that has been introduced and has been advocated for. Basically, what we are talking about are children—now young adults—who were brought into the United States by their parents, and their parents came into the country illegally—that is, they didn't comply with the normal process of applying for citizenship; they came into the country. We all understand why, what motivates a lot of people. A lot of people think, well, I am going to short-circuit the process, jump to the head of the line.

The fact is—and I think Senator LANKFORD said this—in the United States, we don't hold children responsible for the mistakes of their parents. So these children—now young adults—who maybe are able to pursue an education, many of whom have become very accomplished, simply are in a box. I think we have a moral obligation. We have an obligation to ourselves and to our great country to try to take advantage of the talent they have to offer and to help them become full-fledged participants in this great country of ours.

I remember being over at the White House in 2012 after the November election. Speaker Boehner was there. Congressman MCCARTHY, the majority leader, was there. Senator MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, was there. I was there. President Obama was there, along with his staff. The President had for some time threatened to try to deal with this population, this sympathetic population that we are talking about, that we want to try to provide some assistance to. He was frustrated with the slow pace of Congress, and so he was just going to do it by himself. That is what we mean when we talk about deferred action for childhood arrivals. President Obama decided to make an end run around Congress, which has the primary responsibility on immigration matters under the Constitution, and to do it by himself.

Well, haste makes waste sometimes. What happened is that these 690,000—I think at one point it was as many as 700,000 or 800,000 who have actually qualified. Many have dropped off. About 690,000 young adults signed up for this deferred action for childhood arrivals, which allowed them some security but also gave them access to work permits.

Can you imagine what their reaction was when the Federal courts held that what President Obama did was not legal? It was illegal.

When President Trump came into office, he did, I believe, the right thing and said: The courts have spoken. This is not something the President can do by himself or herself; this is something in which Congress needs to get involved.

So he kicked it over to Congress. Thankfully, he gave us some time to act. I believe the date is March 5, after which DACA beneficiaries or recipients can no longer apply for a 2-year period of deferred action. That is exactly the right thing to do because it has precipitated this debate, it has precipitated these negotiations, and it has precipitated a reality check for many of our Democratic friends that, you know, we are a nation of immigrants but we are also a nation of laws.

One reason why I believe this President was elected was because people were enormously frustrated with the lack of border security, with the failure to enforce our immigration laws, and with President Obama's end run around Congress to try to do this unilaterally. This is what precipitated the sorts of negotiations in which we have all been engaged. Senator TILLIS and Senator LANKFORD have been leaders in that effort, putting together an incredible effort to come up with a compassionate and lawful solution and one that respects both of those pillars of our legacy—a nation of immigrants and a nation of laws.

That is why it is so offensive to me for the Democratic leader to decide he is going to ignore the needs of all the children. I think there are roughly 9 million children who benefit from the Children's Health Insurance Program. He is going to give our military the back of his hand—and military families—by holding our needed support for them hostage so that they can somehow force us to deal with this DACA situation today or last night, and if we don't do it, they are going to shut down the U.S. Government.

These 690,000 young men and women truly should be the subject of our compassion, but why would we hold 320 million people hostage to try to get a solution for these 690,000, when we are already hard at work to try to negotiate in good faith an outcome? It just makes no sense at all to me.

I appreciate the meetings that we had that Senator TILLIS alluded to. The one at the White House—I think it was Tuesday. Was it last week? It seems like a year ago. President Trump invited the press into this bipartisan, bicameral meeting. Ordinarily, what happens after the press comes in and takes pictures and asks a few questions is that they are ushered out, but President Trump let them stay in the Cabinet Room for about 45 or 50 minutes. It was the most incredible experience I have ever had, certainly, in that sort of context dealing with sensitive issues like immigration.

I think it was a very positive meeting because it provoked instruction by the President for Majority Leader MCCARTHY; the Democratic whip, Senator DURBIN; the majority whip, Senator CORNYN; and STENY HOYER, the minority leader in the House. We were instructed to do what Senator TILLIS described earlier: come up with a solution to this problem and address the DACA population.

How do we show some compassion? How do we get these young adults out of a quandary not of their making but also deal with border security? I happen to come from a State that has 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico. Senator TILLIS described his experience with Senator HELLER. I was happy to host them because I think seeing it is worth a thousand words. Hopefully, they enjoyed the experience and learned something from it as well.

The Texas-Mexico border is about 2,000 miles long. What the Border Patrol has told me is that they need various tools to secure the border. They need infrastructure like the Secure Fence Act that we voted on in 2006. Then-Senator Obama and then-Senator Clinton and Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, all voted in favor of the Secure Fence Act. Some people call it a wall. Some people call it a fence. Some people call it tactical infrastructure. Whatever you call it, it is a barrier. It is an essential component of border security at some parts of the border, but it is only part of the system.

The system needs to include technology—whether it is unmanned aerial vehicles, ground sensors, radars, aerostats that we saw high in the sky—to try to protect our country against transnational criminal organizations that exploit our porous border to import poison, illegal drugs; that traffic in children for sex or other illicit purposes; or that import their gang members into the United States, only to wreak havoc on communities here in the United States. The object of most of the mayhem associated with that porous border is the immigrant communities in the United States. People act as if there is no negative downside to this porous border and illegal immigration, but I will tell you that frequently the devastation that is wreaked on Americans and on people living here in the United States is in immigrant communities, where these folks do most of their harm.

We are working very hard to try to come up with a solution, and it is frankly insulting that the Democratic leader would try to jam this through and hold hostage all of these other very important programs when we are working in good faith to try to meet that March 5 deadline, and I have every confidence we will. But the border is a little more complicated.

One of the things Secretary Nielsen, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, has pointed out is that because of a provision in the U.S.

law, if you immigrate illegally into the United States from Mexico, for example, the Border Patrol can offer you the opportunity to go back rather than process you for illegal immigration and later deport you, but not if you come from a noncontiguous country, like Central America—Guatemala, El Salvador, for example, Honduras. So what we have seen is thousands of people coming across our southern border exploiting that loophole in our law.

Let me give one example. I asked Secretary Nielsen the other day: If there is a 17-year-old man—you may call him a boy, but for all practical purposes, he is a man, but he has not yet reached 18. If you know from his tattoos—frequently, that is how gang members are identified by the Border Patrol law enforcement officials, from the tattoos they bear. So you know they are members of the MS-13 gang, one of the most violent gangs emanating from Central America and actually Los Angeles, as well, and many of them have migrated back to Central America. Many of them prey on children back there but come up here as part of the drug distribution networks in the United States.

If you know this is a member of MS-13, but they are 17 years old, is there anything you can do under existing law to bar them from the country? She said no.

Under the law, they are required to process that person because he is a minor technically, even though he is a man for all practical purposes, and then Health and Human Services must then place him with a sponsor in the United States. It might be a relative. It doesn't have to be a relative. The previous administration didn't even vet those sponsors adequately, so we don't know how many children who were placed with those sponsors may have been preyed upon, trafficked, recruited as gang members, or otherwise abused.

But this 17-year-old young man, a member of MS-13, would then be placed with a sponsor in the United States and be told, if he had claimed asylum, to come back in a couple of years for his court hearing before an immigration judge.

Senator LANKFORD, I believe, stated that hundreds of thousands of people are backlogged for hearings before immigration judges. We need more immigration judges. In the process, they are told to show back up for a court hearing years in the future, and only about 10 percent show up. I used to say this was sort of an intelligence test—tongue-in-cheek. If you showed up, you flunked the intelligence test, because what most people do is they exploit that vulnerability to simply melt into the great American landscape and become a danger, frankly, to the communities in which they ultimately settle. So this is serious business.

My constituents in Texas—all 28 million of them—want a compassionate solution for these DACA recipients. I mentioned that there are 124,000 of

them who signed up, and there are others who were eligible who did not sign up because they are afraid of the government. They come from places where government is their oppressor frequently, so they have a hard time trusting government even when government is trying to help them in the United States.

My constituents want a solution, but they are sick and tired of the Federal Government failing to do its job on the border. An international border is by definition a Federal responsibility, but the taxpayers in Texas are required to pick up the tab when the Federal Government doesn't live up to its responsibilities, and that has been the status quo for as long as I can remember.

It is frankly galling to hear politicians here in Washington, DC, say: Well, we need to do something to help immigrants—and I am happy to do it as the occasion arises, where it is appropriate, particularly like the DACA recipients. Others, I think, need to be deported as soon as we can because frankly they are a danger to the rest of the law-abiding communities here in the country.

It is frustrating to hear people talk about just one of those two pillars I mentioned. They say: Yeah, we are a nation of immigrants, and we should welcome immigrants. But they don't want to do anything about our porous borders, and they couldn't care less about making sure we have enough border security to protect us from the drugs, the traffickers, and the violence that finds its way into communities all across our country.

So here is the problem: Funding for the Federal Government expires at midnight tonight, and a partial government shutdown will occur if we don't pass a continuing resolution. Our colleagues in the House did their job; they passed a continuing resolution to keep the government up and running until February 16.

I really had a hard time believing what I heard my friend Senator SCHUMER say last night. He said we need to kill this continuing resolution because we need to pass another continuing resolution because continuing resolutions are bad for the military. Well, he lost me on that argument because it makes no sense. It is true that continuing resolutions are bad for the military. That is why we need to get into a regular appropriations process. But does he think a shutdown is good for the military? Does he think a shutdown is good for the 9 million children who depend upon the Children's Health Insurance Program? I think his priorities are completely out of whack.

In my home State, just to take one example, the Army Medical Command said that 2,539 civilian employees at Joint Base San Antonio will be subject to furlough, representing \$188 million in salaries. Some 12,000 Texas Guardsmen won't be able to drill either. I am aware of the Presiding Officer's distinguished service in the Guard, and she

knows what I am talking about. They won't be able to train, they won't be able to prepare for deployments to protect the homeland, and, of course, they won't get paid.

It is estimated that 200,000 Texans will be furloughed with the government shutdown, so it is not just the folks who live in the DC area here in Washington, Virginia, and Maryland, where we have a lot of government employees; people across the country will be negatively affected too.

Our Democratic colleagues' strategy to hold the military funding and children's health insurance hostage is a complete and shameless reversal of what they claimed in the past. It is a complete and shameless reversal. In 2013, the senior Senator from Illinois said that a shutdown is "no way to run a country." He decried what he called "political brinkmanship," saying we need to stop "manufacturing one crisis after the next." Well, I wish he and his colleagues would look in the mirror and listen to their own previous comments. America needs them to.

The truth is, as the Senate majority leader has said, our friends on the other side of the aisle do not oppose a single thing in the bill that the House passed yesterday. They don't oppose anything in the bill. The Senate majority leader is right that this should be an easy "yes" vote for every Senator in the Chamber. The bill continues government funding, prevents a needless shutdown, and, as I said, extends a key health insurance program for vulnerable children.

How in the heck did we get here? How did the Democrats decide that no was the right answer? Well, we worked hard last month and all this month to try to negotiate long-term spending caps that would bring stability back to government funding. One of the biggest issues was to try to make sure we funded our military in a way that helped them prepare and get ready to fight our Nation's wars or, better yet, to prevent future wars by demonstrating the kind of strength and leadership the people have come to expect from the U.S. military. But our Democratic leadership made it clear that they would stall a final agreement on those spending caps until this unrelated issue of deferred action for childhood arrivals that we have been talking about, which doesn't expire until March 5—they were going to hold all the rest of that hostage until it was resolved. They made it clear that they were willing to shut down vital programs for the rest of the country because we haven't agreed on how to resolve that issue, but we are working hard on it. I had another meeting here today on that. I have actually had three meetings today on that topic, and we are going to get it done before the deadline.

While that issue is important and affects roughly 690,000 people, our country is made up of over 320 million people—people who pay taxes, people who expect the Federal Government to

work for them. They sure don't expect to be not paid or laid off or furloughed, if you are a government employee. If you are a citizen expecting the government to provide some service but because the bills aren't being paid because Democrats have shut down the government—well, you are being denied access to the services you have a right to expect.

Our Democratic colleagues are engaged in a dangerous game of chicken, and they could well crash the government just to appease extreme elements in their party, and all of it, every bit of it, is absolutely unnecessary.

Let's call this what it is. Our colleagues are playing favorites and turning their backs on military families and the security needs of the American people. I think that after they had a good night's sleep last night, they probably woke up this morning thinking: What have we done? How do we get out of this? That is why I know the President called Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, over to the White House earlier today. The report I got was that Senator SCHUMER said: Let's have another short-term continuing resolution, maybe until next Tuesday.

Well, that wouldn't solve anything. That would make none of this better. It would just continue the chaos and leave all the things we need to settle, unsettled.

Well, the President did the right thing. He told him: Look, you go back and you talk to the Speaker and the Senate majority leader and you guys work that out. This is what you get paid for. Get her done.

That is good advice.

The threat of a shutdown by the Democratic leader and his colleagues ignores the overwhelming majority of this country that suddenly feels they are not as important as the few they are focused on—the DACA recipients. All Senate Finance Committee Democrats voted for a 5-year SCHIP extension in October, so they are now actually threatening to vote against a program that Senate Democrats on the Finance Committee voted for. I guess, in the immortal words of John Kerry, they were for it before they were against it. Have they forgotten that if Democrats shut down the government, nearly 9 million kids could lose their CHIP coverage? And why? Because we haven't yet been able to come up with an agreement on something—an immigration issue—but our deadline isn't until March. It is not yesterday. It is not today. It is not until March 5. We hope to get it done earlier. I expect we will.

Have they forgotten the 78 percent of defense workers who could be furloughed, laid off; that Active-Duty troops, as well as Guard and Reserve members, would not get paid? In Virginia, there are some 178,000 Federal workers. In Maryland, there are over 145,000. I hope they are on the phone calling their Senators and their Congresspeople. Those are two States

that are both represented by Members prepared to shut down the government tonight. In Texas, as I said, there are some 200,000 Federal employees. All of them will be affected, and everybody else who depends on them to protect our State and our communities—or to provide services that benefit everybody else—they are going to be negatively impacted too. Paychecks could cease, services will be disrupted, all because of an unrelated immigration issue that will not get resolved if the government shuts down.

That is what is so maddening. Shutting down the government will not solve that problem. I think they are out over their skis, and they are trying to figure out how do we get this thing back and save face in the process. They are realizing this is a very bad judgment call and that their action was entirely disproportionate to resolving the issue they want to resolve—and one we are determined to resolve with them in due course.

Let's recall that the 2013 shutdown resulted in the furlough of 850,000 employees and billions of dollars of lost economic productivity. So when the senior Senator from California said yesterday that the results of a shutdown are extremely dire, she wasn't being hyperbolic. She wasn't exaggerating when she talked about the big risks that lie ahead if we don't act. Well, I pray she and her Democratic colleagues will stop stalling, stop playing favorites, and stop daring us to engage in a game of chicken.

I will say it again one last time. We have been negotiating in good faith on a solution for the DACA recipients, and we will continue to do so, but shutting down the government will not solve that problem, and millions of people, including our military, law enforcement, and emergency personnel, could lose their paycheck if Democrats follow through on their threat.

The time to stop playing games is now. We urge them—no—we implore them: Do not shut down the government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise to express my support and to highlight the importance of reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP.

CHIP expired in September, causing great concern and worry for families and providers who depend on this program to care for our Nation's neediest children. Many States have been operating on reserve funds, which will soon run out. It is time we provide the program with the necessary funding to take care of America's children.

I know Arkansas families who rely on the program to provide medical care for their children are pleased with the inclusion of a 6-year reauthorization for CHIP, including in the legislation before this Chamber. This would mark the longest extension for the program since its inception.

I thank Chairman HATCH, the original author of CHIP, for his dedication to the health of our Nation's children, and his bipartisan effort with Ranking Member WYDEN that brought a 5-year CHIP reauthorization out of the Senate Finance Committee last fall.

Approximately, 50,000 children in Arkansas—and nearly 9 million low-income children nationwide—receive healthcare through CHIP. Currently, these children, their families, and providers are living in a cloud of anxious uncertainty.

Take for instance this story of a young Arkansan:

In Little Rock, a precious little girl marks the milestone of turning 8 months old tomorrow in the care of Arkansas Children's Hospital fighting an infection. She has been in the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit and other floors there since the day she turned 2 months old.

Her mother has four other children and spends every hour she can at her daughter's bedside. Every one of those hours is an hour spent away from the baby's brothers and sisters, two and a half hours away in Fort Smith.

Again, she has other children she is trying to take care of at the present time.

In addition to her child's medical condition, her mother is worried because her daughter's care is covered by CHIP.

As much as she looks forward to bringing her daughter home, this mother knows that even those supplies she needs to make that happen—the tubes, the medicines, the fluids—all of those are at risk without that coverage.

This story highlights the reality so many families are currently facing. Failing to reauthorize this important program would have real, direct, and serious consequences.

We must work to ensure these families need not worry every year—or, as of now, months—about continued access to benefits for the health and well-being of their children. We must commit to passing this extension to provide these families peace of mind and stability.

Arkansans recognize how important this program is. My office has received significant amounts of inquiries on the issue. Our response has always been the same: Everyone in Congress is working in good faith to find a solution—at least it seemed that way until a few days ago. I would have supported a 5-year reauthorization like the one my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were pushing for, and guess what. We did even better with a 6-year reauthorization attached to the current CR.

Now those same Members who had been asking for a 5-year reauthorization just days ago are refusing to support the longest extension of the program since its inception. That is not negotiating in good faith. That is not being part of the solution. That is being part of the problem.

Additionally, I continue to be frustrated by this unfortunate new normal of continuing resolutions and stop-gap measures to fund the government year after year.

The idea of willingly facilitating a government shutdown is reckless, but, unfortunately, it appears that some of my colleagues prefer stalemate over robust debate. We need to keep the government open and solve our differences through regular order, understanding, and compromise. Governing by hostage and crisis does not fulfill our moral and our constitutional duties to the American people.

We must not lose sight of our shared goals and purpose or the impact our decisions here have. We must aim to use the power of our offices for good. Supporting children's healthcare and passing this continuing resolution is certainly a component of that goal.

I hope my colleagues remember the story I shared today—and the stories I know they have heard from their constituents—and vote in favor of children's health.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, midnight is approaching and a government shutdown is looming in front of us. I would say—as we can tell in this city—there are not a lot of things Senators will agree on, but I think there is one thing that just about every Senator I have spoken with does agree on; that is, we have a budgeting and spending process that is broken.

In fact, the first bill I introduced in Congress was a bill that simply said: If Members of Congress can't pass a balanced budget, they shouldn't get paid. Nobody here likes to see CR after CR. CR stands for continuing resolution.

Think about it. We have a government that starts its fiscal year every year on October 1. I spent 28 years in the private sector, and 13 of those years were with Procter & Gamble, a Fortune 500 company. I spent time in a small family business, and I spent time as part of a cloud computing startup that grew over 1,000 jobs. We took the company public. So I have had a lot of experience in budgets, management spending, and ensuring that you actually take in more money than you spend because that is all profit in business.

Here in Washington, DC, we are now—October, November, December, middle of January—we are 3½ months into the fiscal year without having nailed down the spending plan. It is broken. That needs to be reformed.

On a more optimistic note, there is a group of Republican and Democratic Senators who are having discussions about how to change the way the budgeting and spending works in Washington, DC, to deliver a better outcome for the American people.

Here we are at this moment, just hours away from a looming government shutdown. So whether we are in business or dealing with issues in personal life, we have a choice to make right here in front of us—a choice we have to make in less than 7 hours. We can either keep the Federal Govern-

ment open and fund health insurance for 24,000 Montana children—it is about 9 million American children. The idea was, let's put something in play that ought to be agreeable to both sides—something pretty clean, not a tax with a bunch of political, divisive kind of issues. No, we are going to extend the funding of the government, avoid a government shutdown, and let's permanently reauthorize, for 6 years, the Children's Health Insurance Program. It is very popular with the American people. Either we do that or we shut the government down.

Here is where we are. There will be a lot of folks spinning a lot of different messages, but let me try to articulate exactly where we are in as simple terms as possible. The House has passed an agreement to keep the lights on and to fund Children's Health Insurance. They passed it. The President has said he will sign that agreement to keep the lights on and to fund Children's Health Insurance. The House has passed it, the President says he will sign it, and now it is up to this body.

Will we get 60 Senators—it will take Republicans and Democrats—because there are only 51 Republican Senators, and the rules of the Senate require 60. Will we get 60 Senators—a good bipartisan vote—to keep the lights on and fund Children's Health Insurance? That is the question. We have less than 7 hours to figure that out.

I implore my Democratic colleagues not to follow their leader, who insists that DACA and illegal immigration get fixed today, in the next 7 hours. We all know illegal immigration is a very important issue for our Nation. It has to be addressed. We must secure our borders, and we must resolve this issue, but let's keep it all in perspective.

In my home State of Montana, there are less than 100 DACA residents versus 1 million Montanans who would be hurt by a government shutdown. A shutdown hurts our men and women who wear the uniform. To say it another way, the choice is between 100 DACA recipients—less than 100 in Montana—or the 24,000 children who depend on the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Don't let these issues get confused by smoke and mirrors. That is the fundamental issue right now that CHUCK SCHUMER and the leaders of our friends across the aisle are talking about shutting down the government over.

The right thing to do here is to vote yes today. Let's continue to fund the government while we work to address these issues related to illegal immigration and border security.

Senator LANKFORD was here earlier. There are good bipartisan discussions going on as we speak. These are difficult issues to get sorted out. They are divisive issues, but I think there is a path forward. To me, to say they have to get resolved tonight or shut down the government is the wrong position to take.

A shutdown means no long-term certainty for Montana's children. A shutdown hurts our military. A shutdown hurts our veterans.

I don't like another CR. I would rather not have another CR. But guess what. You get paid to come here and make a choice. Sometimes it is between two options; neither one is very appealing. I don't like the idea of having another CR. It is just an example of a broken budgeting process. But the choice is that either we buy some more time to resolve these issues of illegal immigration or we shut down the government, harming our military, our veterans, our seniors, and compromising national security. I believe a government shutdown is a mistake.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to talk about some of the issues we are facing as we approach a deadline tonight, but I really wanted to start with one observation about where we are and where we could be in the next couple of days.

Some of the debate is focused on simply what could happen at midnight were there to be a shutdown of the Federal Government, but there is another alternative, of course, and that is—well, two, really: to have an agreement that would carry forward before the deadline. That is, in my judgment, less likely to happen. I don't think anybody believes that would happen, necessarily, but the other option, of course, is to have a number of days ahead of us—3 days, 4 days, whatever the leadership on the two sides can agree to—to continue negotiations because, of course, we have a range of issues. Sometimes we haven't talked enough about the long list of issues. I will get into a few tonight, but there is a rather long list of issues, some of which have already been the subject of not just consensus but a bipartisan piece of legislation, actual bill text that has been introduced or could be introduced in short order, in the next few days or even the next couple of hours.

Then there are other issues where there have been ongoing issues for a long period of time, haven't reached consensus, but if we all give ourselves a deadline and stay here—and I hope people in both parties will stay for the next few days no matter what happens tonight. If there is an extension of 3 or 4 days, that doesn't make it any less challenging because that just means there will be a short-term deadline. I don't think it makes any sense to go another month because the can, in essence, will be kicked down the road again.

We need to make decisions about some big issues. There are some who have observed that even if you were in favor of the measure that came over from the House last night, which I have

real trouble with—a lot of gaping holes in that proposal, a lot of urgent matters for many Americans that have not been addressed in that proposal—but even if you favor that, you can also still hold the position you don't favor continuing resolution after continuing resolution. I guess we are on our fourth resolution, if we have the right count, since October 1—not that long ago.

So that is at least my sense of where we could be in the next couple of days: not leaving Washington and staying at the negotiating table on a range of issues. That is the reasonable thing to do, not only to keep the government operating and open but also to finally resolve some major issues, which I think most of both parties want to solve.

Let me start tonight with some personal letters. One of the major issues which is not resolved, but there has been a lot of effort made which is bipartisan, is the issue of pensions. I have received letters from a lot of Pennsylvanians who say: Look, it is up to you and up to the people in both parties to solve this pension crisis which has engulfed so many families. In Pennsylvania, if you add up the categories of people affected—retirees and their families—you are talking about at least 35,000 families, usually because the largest share of retirees are coal miners in Pennsylvania. I am sure it is true in other States as well.

I got a letter from a woman in Washington County, PA, right in the southwestern corner of our State. I will not read the whole letter, but she was talking about her husband who is a retired miner. She said: "He worked for many years in the coal mines and endured dangerous conditions, unsafe work hazards, and a mine fire which he narrowly escaped and closed the mine forcing him to lose his job."

She concludes by saying: "This pension is so important to him and to us"—and she goes on from there.

That is one person talking about her husband doing the most dangerous work imaginable. I am not sure there is a more dangerous job in the world than coal mining, and I know of what I speak because of the corner of Pennsylvania I am from, the anthracite coal region.

Here is another letter from the same corner of the State, Southwestern Pennsylvania, in this case, in particular, talking about the pension legislation which is before the Senate right now, the so-called Butch Lewis Act. Here is what this man says about his family, talking about the way he earned a pension. He said:

We gave up pay raises, to get a meager pension, and as we get older we can't start over. Please [pass . . .] the Butch Lewis act.

A third letter, also from Southwestern Pennsylvania—in this case from Westmoreland County, one county over, just to the east of Pittsburgh. This individual talks about the pension he received. He said: "I am facing pension cuts that will have an immediate

and devastating impact on my family." He goes on from there.

We have even more letters. A letter from the same corner of the State, Fayette County—one of the great counties of Pennsylvania in the most southwestern corner, right next to Greene County, right on the Ohio or West Virginia border, depending on which side you are looking at.

This individual said to me in the letter:

[T]here are so many retired miners, widows and families that rely upon those benefits each month. Including my mother and me, she is a widow and I have cerebral palsy and we depend on my dad's pension to survive on the limited income.

So the miner is speaking about the pension they earned and their hope and expectation, which is a reasonable expectation that the promise made in that pension would be fulfilled, or it is the perspective of a son or a daughter or a wife or even, unfortunately, in many cases, a widow talking about a miner who had passed away.

Here is another letter from Southwestern Pennsylvania, talking about that word I just used, "promise."

This [pension] was a promise made by the government. . . . we kept ours . . . and now we hope that you will continue to KEEP THE PROMISE.

"KEEP THE PROMISE," all in capital letters, by this individual.

I am 73 years old and if I was to lose my pension, my wife & I would be forced to live in poverty.

Here is another pension letter. This is not from a coal miner but from a retired truckdriver—another group of Americans affected when the U.S. Senate doesn't get pension legislation done, like we can do in the next couple of days. "I am a retired truck driver . . . spent 25 years of my life in this occupation . . ." and asking me as his Senator "if you could do whatever you can do to preserve that pension for my wife and I."

Another letter from the northeastern corner of Pennsylvania, not far from where I live, talks about the same act, the Butch Lewis Act. In this case, the letter is about his father: My father, for over 25 years, was paying into a pension. He was a dock worker, physically loading trucks by hand. He did this to provide for my family and to ensure we had medical coverage and also a pension.

Then it talks about a pension. His dad was told at one point that the pension was wiped out, that everything he had worked for was taken away. He worked hard for 25 years—nights, weekends, double shifts sometimes, on and on and on.

I heard from the majority leader last night that somehow these kinds of issues that are part of this larger debate are not urgent. He said the only urgent matter is the government funding bill. I would agree that is urgent, but I would also agree that if you are a retired coal miner or the family of a retired coal miner or a retired truckdriver or you are owed a pension of any

kind for all the work you did in your life, your situation is urgent. It is not something we can put off and say: Well, why don't you wait another 6 months? Wait for a couple more CRs—continuing resolutions—and we will get to you later.

The pension issue is as urgent as any other. There is a lot of talk around here as if it isn't. It is very, very urgent.

I will give you another urgent issue—the issue of community health centers. Here is a letter I received from South-eastern Pennsylvania—just outside of Philadelphia—about funding for community health centers, which, just like the pension issue, is not addressed in the House proposal or the House bill that passed. They don't address pensions. They don't address community health centers. By the way, the deadline for community health centers, just like children's health, was way back in October—October 1.

I am glad that some Republicans are finally—finally, after more than 100 days—starting to clue in a little bit to children's health insurance. They are talking about it. It is great that they are finally talking about children's health insurance, which they haven't talked about much since they let the deadline expire months ago. The majority party allowed that to happen. Maybe by midnight tonight they will start talking about community health centers that serve 800,000 people in Pennsylvania. I hope they start talking about it at least, and maybe we can come together and get something done.

Here is what she says about community health centers: We serve hundreds of thousands of underserved people who deserve the quality of care we provide. They have lives filled with trauma and in turn suffer from social, physical, and behavioral issues that will go untreated if funding for community health centers go away.

I guess that is not urgent. If you rely upon a community health center for your healthcare, it is urgent. It is every bit as urgent as anything we have talked about in the last couple of days and weeks. The House bill does nothing on that, nothing on miners' pensions, nothing on pensions, nothing on community health centers. And we are supposed to just accept that and move on and have another continuing resolution when they don't even address it in their proposal.

Here is another letter about community health centers. This one is about the patients who live in rural and underserved areas, who are in areas where there is a great need for health centers. I guess it is not urgent for those folks in rural areas who depend upon these health centers. As I said, in Pennsylvania, if you look at the total—rural and urban and everything in between—it is 800,000 people. I guess it is not urgent for them. This House bill does nothing for those community health centers and those people who live in rural and urban areas who depend upon

those health centers. I guess we should just wait—wait another month, wait another 6 months, wait another year—for community health centers to be funded. The majority allowed funding for those to expire, just as they allowed funding for children's health insurance to expire.

Here is another letter that talks about health centers. This individual says:

If Congress kicks this can down the road one more time, it will be a signal to health centers that we need to implement measures that will result in site closures, layoffs and reduced services.

I guess community health centers are not urgent.

How about this program that is also not addressed in the House legislation—the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program. This is an evidenced-based home visiting program that supports at-risk pregnant women and young families. It is a great program that has been in place for the last couple of years. In fiscal year 2017, funding was about \$400 million. That is not addressed either. I guess that is not urgent, just like community health centers and just like pensions for retired coal miners and truckdrivers and others. None of this, apparently, according to the majority, is urgent. None of this is urgent.

I will tell you what was urgent for the majority at the end of last year, November and December: an obsession with getting a tax bill passed, which did pretty well for the superrich and big corporations. There was all kinds of time for that—negotiations between and among Republicans, discussions and changes in the bill, between and among Republicans only, for a tax bill. That was very urgent. To get that tax bill rammed through—that was very urgent, so children's health insurance had to wait even though in December it was already 2 months overdue, 2 months after expiration. Community health centers had to wait, as well, because you had to get your Republican tax bill done. All of that had to wait. Coal miners' pensions had to wait, too, because you had to get the tax bill done for the rich and for corporations.

How about the issue that received a lot of attention, the so-called DACA Program, the Dreamers? Right now, we have seven Senate Republicans, at last count—it might have gone higher—seven Senate Republicans have joined with Senate Democrats on a bipartisan bill to do a lot of things but principally improve border security and help young Dreamers. That is a bill that is ready to go right now, and it is urgent because people have been deported, and both parties assert that they are concerned about these Dreamers. We could get it done right now. One Republican Senator said he could get it done in half an hour. Let's say he is way off—maybe an hour and certainly a few days. We could get that done as well.

There is a lot that is urgent, and there is a lot that is left on the table

with this House bill that came over last night.

I hope both parties continue to negotiate. I hope we will heed the words that were sent out last night by the Defense Department. Here is what Dana W. White said:

We have been working under a Continuing Resolution for three years now.

Meaning the Defense Department.

Our current CR expires tomorrow, 19 Jan. This is wasteful and destructive.

She hopes and I think our military hopes that we don't keep kicking the can down the road. Let's come together and get so much done for the American people that we can get done tonight, tomorrow morning, tomorrow night, Sunday morning, Sunday night, Monday morning, Monday afternoon, Monday night, Tuesday. We can stay here and get a lot of this done, and then we can move on to other things. We can get a major list of problems solved, not this House bill full of holes that leaves so many Americans out, leaves coal miners out, leaves truckdrivers out. It leaves millions out. By one estimate, 27 million people in the country get their healthcare at community health centers, 800,000 in Pennsylvania. We could do all that, bring the country together, and then move on to other issues that we haven't discussed yet, such as infrastructure, fixing roads and bridges, and bringing broadband to rural America. Fill in the blank with whatever else you want to work on, but there is a lot we could do.

The President said that he wanted to make infrastructure a priority. It is going to be difficult to get to that if we keep getting stuck on these 3-week or 2-month continuing resolutions.

I know there has been a lot of chatter today about blame games. Look, according to my count, there might be only one politician in the country who has spoken directly and I think repeatedly, but at least once that we know of, about a government shutdown, and that happens to be the President.

I will hold up this poster, which is a statement dated May 2. "Our country needs a good shutdown," said the President on May 2, 2017. I hope the majority will not agree with that, that our country needs that. We need to come together and use this opportunity to do the following: Fund the Federal Government. Make sure retirees have the pension they have been waiting for for a long time. Coal miners have been coming to this town for years now trying to get their healthcare. They were promised that in early 2016. It didn't happen because the majority made them wait. They were promised in 2016—later in the year—that it would happen in the fall when the Finance Committee got the coal miners healthcare bill done. It didn't happen in the fall. The majority made them wait. Then, of course, they said: Oh, no, but after the election, in December of 2016, it will get done then. But the majority made them wait. After months and months of pressing, these coal miners finally got the promise fulfilled by

getting their healthcare in April of 2017.

At the time, they said: We appreciate the fact that we got the healthcare problem solved. Now we need to work on the pensions.

So the pensions for coal miners didn't start in April of 2017. That was part of the original bill, but we were only able to get the healthcare part of it done. So miners' pensions goes back much further than the early part of 2017; it goes back to 2016 and 2015 and years before that.

I would hope that before we move to bringing the sides together, that we would make those pensions and those retirees a priority. I would hope we would make community health centers a priority, as well as getting done for children what we should get done.

One point about the Children's Health Insurance Program. I am glad that my Republican friends are finally talking about the program. They were rather quiet the last couple of months when they refused to bring it up on the floor. Of course, everyone knows that if you put a CHIP bill on this floor tonight, it would pass in minutes. We would get an overwhelming vote. If the majority really cares about it, they would do just that, just as we have been asking for months. But, of course, children weren't a priority because they had to get a tax bill done. That was the big priority. They had to get that big tax bill done so that the corporations would be happy with Republican Senators.

Let me make one point about children's health. We have to get that done as well, but the problem is, for a lot of reasons, the cost has changed a good bit. Here is the reality. The CHIP program, according to this proposal, is limited in time to 6 years. If Republicans included a 10-year extension, it would actually save billions of dollars and, more importantly, would remove us from the cycle of funding crises to which we have grown accustomed.

If it is less expensive and provides more certainty, why don't we do CHIP for 10 years? I would like to make it permanent. That would be the best result, the optimal result. But why not 10 years? Because of a whole series of dynamics that happened over the last couple of months, the cost has actually gone down. If you can get a cheaper rate, so to speak, for a 10-year extension, why not make it 10 years? I know the Freedom Caucus and House Republicans came up with 6, but I thought they wanted to save money, and I hope they want to save money and help kids. I hope we can come together on that as well. Let's make it a 10-year commitment to our kids. I think the Senate Republicans passed a tax bill that had a corporate tax break that is permanent—permanent tax relief for big corporations. Why not at least give children's health insurance and the children who depend on it at least 10 years. Give them a decade, right? That is not a big sacrifice. Of course, it would be

better if we gave them permanent certainty like the corporations got with their taxes. At least give them 10 years. Now that both parties are beyond the 5 years, let's give them 10 years, and it will have the added benefit of saving billions of dollars.

We can do all of this in the next number of hours and days. We can get all of this done, and then we can move forward in a bipartisan way on to other priorities. We cannot, simply, accept a measure from the House that is full of holes—that does nothing for those retirees, that does nothing for community health centers, that does nothing to address the opioid crisis. We didn't get into that, but we could easily be funding more for our local communities.

I hope we don't listen to this statement here that somehow this is something that is good for the country. We need to stay here and continue negotiations and, in some cases, wrap up promising negotiations that have already reached a consensus. We should stay here tonight and Saturday and Sunday and Monday and Tuesday at least. That is not asking much to negotiate hard for 4 days. Let's see what we can get done in a couple of days and see where we are.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment at 10 p.m. tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor on the verge of what could be a government shutdown.

I have listened to my colleagues throughout the day suggest—particularly on the other side of the aisle—that this is only about Dreamers. Dreamers should be able to realize their dream. I have been as passionate as anyone about believing that these young people, who only know one flag, the flag of the United States, its stars and stripes; who only sing one national

anthem, the Star-Spangled Banner; and who only know one country, the United States of America, have, and should have, the opportunity to ultimately realize their dream. They responded to the Federal Government's requests that they come forward, register themselves, give us all types of information, trust us, and they did. Now the government must respond to them, but what is going on here is beyond Dreamers.

This is the Federal Government hurtling from short-term funding resolution to short-term funding resolution instead of having the appropriate appropriations pass when they were due last October—last October—instead of working to pass the necessary appropriations to keep the government not just operating but to do it efficiently, on an annual basis, so our institutions can appropriately plan and so we can save money instead of spending more money because of what it costs for short-term preparations.

Our Republican colleagues were busy, yes, but they were busy in October and November and December not preparing for the government's needs but to have a drive in ecstasy toward tax cuts for the wealthiest people in the country and large corporations on the backs of middle class and working families. That is what they spent their time on. Then they come and say: Oh, but it is urgent that we do this now. You had months in which you did nothing—nothing.

Now, I must say to my friends—and I have heard many of them who are budget hawks and deficits hawks—this is no way to run a government, much less the greatest country on the face of the Earth. Who wants to dictate to countries about being responsible, when we want to give them assistance or we are trying to get them to do trade things, and this is the image we send to the world?

Now, only in Washington—I have been here a while. Only in Washington could Republicans, who control the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and the President of the United States at the White House, try to blame a Democratic minority for their failure to govern. Let's be clear why we are here today. Instead of providing our military, our first responders, our healthcare centers, and all of our Federal agencies with the long-term funding they need to efficiently and effectively serve the American people, Senate Republicans want to pass yet another—another—another stop-gap, woefully insufficient, short-term continuing resolution.

In fairness, I tried to give my Republican colleagues the benefit of the doubt. I voted for the first continuing resolution. I voted for the second continuing resolution, but enough is enough.

I got my start in local government. I was a member of a school board, and I was a mayor, and then I served in the State legislature. Let me just say, there is no place from my past experience that you could do what we do

here. You needed to have a budget done on time. Maybe you might lapse a day—what would have been for us last October—but you couldn't get beyond that. You couldn't do that in the State legislature for the State budget, couldn't do it on the city council, couldn't do it on the school board. Families can't do it in their own lives. We shouldn't do it on behalf of the 320-some-odd million people who call America home.

Now, the CR—this continuing resolution to keep the government open one more time, for the fourth time; not the first time, not the second time, not the third time but the fourth time because we are all basically about tax cuts for the wealthy but not taking care of everybody in terms of government funding—kicks the can down the road again without making the necessary investments into our communities. It continues the chaos and the dysfunction that has defined the last year of Republican control. It doesn't fund community health centers, something I am so proud of in my home State of New Jersey—federally qualified health centers. They take everybody who comes through the door—all taken. You have insurance? Great. You don't have insurance? We will take care of you. You have Medicaid or Medicare? Fine. Bottom line, a system that delivers quality healthcare. This doesn't do it. It leaves them in the lurch out there.

The CR doesn't set budget numbers to fund national security or domestic investment priorities. We talk about our national defense—and, yes, I am one of those who is willing to plus-up national defense—but guess what, the nondefense side of the budget is about homeland security, the FBI, the Secret Service, the Treasury Department, the National Institutes of Health that protects us in terms of illnesses, the CDC—all of these elements are in the domestic discretionary side of the budget so they are important, too, but we don't fund budget numbers that allow the national security or domestic investment priorities to take place.

I heard Leader MCCONNELL say last night that the CR is about helping all Americans. Well, I will tell you, it doesn't do squat for the 3.5 million Americans who call Puerto Rico their home and who are suffering in an appalling human catastrophe in the wake of devastating storms. It doesn't adequately assist communities in Texas and Florida and Western States that are ravaged by fires that are still waiting for Congress to act on disaster relief. Even the Secretary of Defense's spokesperson said we have been working under a continuing resolution for 3 years now. Our current CR expires tomorrow. This is wasteful. This is the Secretary of Defense's spokesperson: This is wasteful and destructive. We need a fully funded fiscal year 2018 budget or face ramifications for our military.

I would add that these young people—many of them who wear the uni-

form of the United States and are willing to risk their lives and die for the country that seems to want to reject them—they deserve an opportunity to have a resolution at last.

Let me just say, I know the President has said that maybe the country needs—would benefit from a good shutdown. I don't ever think there is a good shutdown. I know, in the past, when President Obama was in the White House, then Mr. Trump said: Oh, it is the President who is the leader. It is the President who has to bring everybody into the room. It is the President who has to get people to come to a conclusion.

Well, you showed up late in the game—very late in the game—the final hours.

Finally, I think all of us who have been around either this institution or the Congress know that you need 60 votes in the U.S. Senate. I have compromised many times on foreign policy. I compromised with my colleagues to try to achieve a solution for the DACA legislation. There were hard choices to be made and things I don't like, but I compromised. Let me tell you something. Sixty votes, you don't even have your 60 votes. Two of our Republican colleagues have said—I understand why because they don't want to keep kicking the can down the road: No, we are not going to vote for this. One of our colleagues is infirm, not here. So they are not anywhere even near their numbers.

So that means, when you need 60 and you are far from it, that you have to engage in a negotiation and a compromise. It is not just stick it and accept it because when that happens, then we are on the dangerous path that when this short-term resolution doesn't solve itself—if we agree to a month—then ultimately we will have another CR, and maybe we will like even less what is in that CR. Maybe there will be language that we will find particularly problematic. Maybe there will even be numbers we don't care for.

The point is, if you know you need 60, you don't wait until the final hours to try to come to a negotiation.

I would rather live a day on my feet than a life on my knees, in defense of the 9 million people who call New Jersey home, to make sure they get what they need, not what I am shafted to try to have to accept.

So I personally am for a very short-term resolution that makes leadership and the White House and all of us, as far as I am concerned, stay here working to achieve what the American people deserve, which is a full funding of their government—no more short-term lurching from crisis to crisis. This is an opportunity to take care of those Americans who have been hurt in hurricanes and storms and fires and the people of Puerto Rico; an opportunity to give Dreamers their dream; an opportunity to fund our public health centers; an opportunity to fund the Children's Health Insurance Program

not for 6 years but for a decade. We have seen study after study that says we could save millions if we funded it over a decade. Why should we not save millions?

This is an opportunity to deal with the pensions that people who worked a lifetime and, through no fault of their own, now find themselves possibly shortchanged. Let's help them retire with the dignity they deserve.

This is an opportunity to make sure the National Institutes of Health—which is doing ground-breaking research on the Alzheimer's that took my mother's life, on the Parkinson's that affects our neighbors, on the diseases that affect our people, but you can't do long-term trials if you don't know what your funding is going to be. The list goes on and on.

The people of America deserve far better than what they are getting, and I reject the proposition that you can just stick it to us and suggest that we have to accept it. You create the crisis and then you want us to accept it.

Well, it is time to get the job done on behalf of the American people. That is why some of us will not support a longer term funding resolution, because all it will do is get us right back to where we are today. The American people deserve much more than that.

They deserve that, and there is no reason we can't deliver that.

With that, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint, PN1355.

I will object because the Department of the Treasury has failed to respond to a letter I sent on September 29, 2017, to a bureau within the Department seeking documents relevant to an ongoing investigation by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Despite several phone calls between committee staff and Treasury personnel to prioritize particular requests within that letter, the Treasury Department has to date failed to provide any documents.

My objection is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Ryder in any way. However, the Department must recognize that it has an ongoing obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the Iowans who have traveled to the Capitol today to be with us for the March for Life.

I commend them and the many other Americans who have traveled here

from every corner of the country to embrace the sanctity of life. Their participation in this march symbolizes their compassion and concern for the most innocent and vulnerable among us.

I also want to call on my colleagues to join us in supporting the immediate passage of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This common-sense measure, which I have cosponsored, recognizes that the government has an interest in protecting the unborn from the excruciating pain they are capable of experiencing during a late-term abortion.

Some people call this measure “Micah’s Law,” in honor of an Iowa boy, Micah Pickering, who was born at 20 weeks postfertilization. I have met Micah and his parents. Micah didn’t just survive. He is a beautiful little boy who is thriving.

Research suggests that, after the fifth month of pregnancy, the nervous system of the unborn child has developed to the point where that child is capable of detecting and responding to painful stimuli. This also is around the time when the unborn baby is soothed by the mother’s voice. We are hearing that babies may learn within the womb, absorbing language sooner than we previously thought, so it should surprise no one that these same unborn babies can experience intense pain during a late-term abortion when their limbs are being torn apart in their mother’s wombs.

Currently, the United States is one of only about seven countries in the world that permit elective abortions past 5 months. Among the very few that embrace late-term abortions are Vietnam, Singapore, and North Korea. Passing this bill, which imposes restrictions only on elective abortions and only after the fifth month of pregnancy, would bring the United States in line with the vast majority of countries around the globe. Lawmakers in these other countries have grasped the concept that late-term abortions are essentially barbaric and often unnecessary.

Many of my colleagues actively supported the Americans with Disability Act. How could you support a measure like that and not also seek to protect the unborn babies whose parents might choose to end their lives late in pregnancy merely due to a disability like Down syndrome? I believe that the lives of unborn babies with this condition have the same value as those of other unborn babies.

If you do not support restrictions on abortions after the fifth month of pregnancy, when infants at the same stage of development are being born prematurely and, like Micah Pickering, surviving long term, then what, exactly, is your limit—if any—on abortion?

I remind my colleagues that the American people overwhelmingly support restrictions on late-term abortions. Numerous States, including

Iowa, already have passed similar legislation to protect the unborn baby who is capable of experiencing pain.

In 2016, I convened a congressional hearing at which two doctors testified in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. We learned that about a quarter of the babies born prematurely, around 5 months, will survive long term if given proper medical assistance.

One of the doctors who testified, Colleen Malloy, is an associate professor in the pediatrics department at Northwestern University’s School of Medicine. According to Dr. Malloy, by 20 weeks of development, the unborn baby’s pain receptors are present and linked. As further explained by Dr. Malloy, at 20 weeks’ fetal age, premature babies are “kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. We can easily witness their humanity, as well as their experiences with pain.”

Dr. Anthony Levatino, a practicing gynecologist with decades of experience, testified similarly at a House hearing several years ago. Dr. Levatino estimates that he performed over 1,000 abortions in private practice, until his adopted daughter died in a car crash. His child’s death was a life-changing event that led him to stop performing abortions. Performing an abortion on a 24-week-old unborn child is undoubtedly painful for that baby, Dr. Levatino testified. Scientific studies confirm that the unborn can experience pain after the fifth month.

The Judiciary Committee in 2016 also heard testimony from Dr. Kathi Aultman, a former abortion provider. She told us, an “abortionist knows exactly what he or she is doing because they must count the body parts after each procedure” to make sure they have cut the whole baby out of the mother.

Dr. Aultman also questioned why an unborn baby who can live outside the womb should be given no consideration, no protection, and no rights just because the child is unwanted, and she is right. Why shouldn’t we have compassion for babies whose nervous systems are developed enough for them to experience pain? Why shouldn’t we protect them from dismemberment with steel tools?

This is a measure that the majority of Americans—including a majority of women—broadly support. Once again, I urge my colleagues to embrace the sanctity of innocent human life and vote for this landmark legislation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CAPTAIN JOHN YOUNG

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, we are on the eve of a new era of space exploration. We are constructing the world’s largest rocket and a deep space capsule

to send humans to Mars. Two new commercial crew capsules are under construction to ferry astronauts to and from the International Space Station starting later this year. Huge industrial complexes to manufacture and process new rockets and satellites are being built in record speed to further advance America’s leadership in space.

The successes of space exploration today are built upon the brave efforts of NASA’s past pioneers. I am saddened to note that, on January 5 of this year, we lost one of those national heroes, astronaut and retired U.S. Navy CAPT John Young.

Captain Young has been called the astronaut’s astronaut. Indeed, if you ask around the astronaut corps who they most looked up to, my guess is John Young’s name would come up quite a bit.

Captain Young was among the second group of astronauts chosen for the early space program. He flew to space six times, the only astronaut to fly in the Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle programs. In addition to walking and driving a rover on the surface of the moon, Captain Young commanded the very first space shuttle mission.

Taking off like a rocket and landing like an airplane, the space shuttle could not be tested in space without a crew. It was perhaps the riskiest flight, spaceflight ever endeavored; yet whether it was landing on the Moon or rocketing off the pad in the space shuttle, Captain Young was the essence of cool, his heart never topping 90 beats per minute.

By the time John Young retired, he had spent over four decades at NASA. First at the Navy and later at NASA, Young dedicated his entire career to public service.

Throughout his career, Captain Young was a tireless advocate for safety at the agency. He was a brilliant and intuitive engineer. He was known for writing scathing memos regarding safety problems at the agency, asking penetrating technical questions at reviews, and doing it all with a simple “tell it like it is” country-boy mentality that he never lost from his central Florida upbringing.

It may seem a contradiction that the man who commanded perhaps the riskiest space mission in history was also one of the agency’s most outspoken advocates for safety, but it is not.

Captain Young strongly believed we must explore the unknown and push further out into the cosmos, but he also believed the men and women who bravely venture into space on all our behalves deserve the very best we can do to bring them home safely.

We are seeing the fruits of nearly a decade of transformation and renewal, while at the same time reverently marking the passing of the first generation of space explorers. Just in the last few years, in addition to John Young, we have lost John Glenn, Scott Carpenter, Gene Cernan, Dick Gordon,

Edgar Mitchell, and Neil Armstrong. We have also lost the great Sally Ride. While we mourn the loss of these American heroes, we are forever indebted to them for their extraordinary contributions to humanity.

I am so grateful NASA has had over the years the kinds of wisdom, experience, and technical skills in its leadership that were so embodied by heroes like Captain Young. We are extremely fortunate to have, in NASA Acting Administrator Robert Lightfoot, a leader who is universally acclaimed for his competence and professionalism. I have the utmost confidence in Acting Administrator Lightfoot and am thankful to have his steady hand on the tiller. I will continue to fight to see that NASA has leadership that carries on the tradition of having true space professionals at the helm of such an important agency.●

RECOGNIZING TAMARACK AEROSPACE GROUP

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, over the past 20 years the aerospace industry in my home State of Idaho has grown by an astonishing 40 percent, with a number of small business firms leading the way. As you may know, the aerospace industry is a complex field that requires a passion for innovation and great attention to detail. I am pleased to say that, in my home State of Idaho, these qualities are found in successful small businesses all across the State. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my privilege to honor Tamarack Aerospace Group as the Small Business of the Month for January 2018. Tamarack Aerospace is a pioneer in a variety of aerospace engineering products that are used in airplanes across the Nation and the world. This small business contributes significantly to Idaho's reputation as a destination for trailblazers in the aerospace industry and is a remarkable example of entrepreneurial innovation.

In 2010, Mr. Nicholas Guida founded Tamarack Aerospace Group in Sandpoint, ID. Mr. Guida has over 25 years of experience in the aerospace industry, including time spent as an aerospace engineer, a safety consultant, and as a test pilot. Since Tamarack's founding, Mr. Guida assembled an impressive team of six diverse professionals with years of experience across various sectors of the aerospace industry. From veteran Navy pilots to skilled mechanical engineers, the team at Tamarack combines experience with a passion for innovation.

Tamarack Aerospace specializes in something called active winglet innovation with their product, ATLAS, which actively reduces the load placed on each wing of an aircraft. Tamarack's winglets allow for optimal efficiency without compromising an aircraft's structural integrity. As a result, aircraft equipped with this technology have lower operating costs, as

well as increased fuel efficiency and life of the aircraft's wings. This technology makes air travel cheaper and more efficient, without compromising the safety of pilots or passengers. Tamarack will soon be representing Idaho internationally at the Singapore Airshow next month, showcasing their new technological innovations in collaboration with the Idaho Department of Commerce's exhibit at the airshow. It is very exciting to see these accomplished entrepreneurs represent Idaho and the United States on the international stage.

The Tamarack Aerospace Group is making an outsized impact in a highly technical field and recently received much deserved recognition for these contributions by being named a winner of the 61st Annual Laureate Award by Aviation Week & Space Technology. The award recognizes those who inspire innovation and show leadership in the world of aviation. It is this kind of innovation that continues to set our great Nation apart and propel us forward. Mr. Guida and the team at Tamarack have also shown tremendous resourcefulness, resilience, and perseverance in navigating the certification and regulatory processes to bring their winglets to market, which is no easy feat.

I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Mr. Guida and all of the employees at Tamarack Aerospace Group for being selected as the January 2018 Small Business of the Month. You make Idaho proud, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1660. An act to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency.

H.R. 2954. An act to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which

depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1660. An act to direct the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to submit to Congress a report on the development and use of global health innovations in the programs, projects, and activities of the Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2954. An act to amend the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 to specify which depository institutions are subject to the maintenance of records and disclosure requirements of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 19, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex Diekmann Peak."

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-156. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Texas urging the United States Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Texas to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to 200 nautical miles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 105

Whereas, in recent years, the Gulf of Mexico has contained the highest total allowable catch of red snapper in decades, but in 2016, anglers experienced the shortest recreational fishing season to date, lasting less than two weeks; and

Whereas, the U.S. government has overseen the Gulf recreational red snapper fishery for nearly four decades; today, federal management systems attempt to regulate red snapper fishing by the pound with tools specifically designed to manage the commercial sector, despite the fact that federal data collection systems are incapable of accounting to such a level of specificity for recreational harvests; and

Whereas, the U.S. government has, moreover, neglected to use recent data to provide meaningful guidelines and requirements for a systematic reallocation of federal fisheries; except for minor adjustments to account for errors in its own data collection system, the Gulf red snapper fishery allocation is based on highly suspect data from 1979-1986 and has remained unchanged since 1991; and

Whereas, the federal government is currently promoting a management strategy to

privatize the Gulf red snapper fishery; approximately 50 percent of the fishery is already held by private businesses, while another 20 percent has been designated to be sold; shares of this public resource have also been given away for free, based on a commercial operator's past catch history; and

Whereas, because of extraordinarily remiss requirements in its conflict of interest guidelines, the federal fisheries management system allows commercial operators who already own red snapper shares or who may be gifted shares to serve on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and to cast votes on issues that will result in direct financial benefit for them; and

Whereas, by creating a prohibitive environment for anglers and ethical issues among user groups and stakeholders, the U.S. government has proved itself incapable of properly managing red snapper fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, and all five states along the Gulf Coast have increasingly needed to implement regulations and seasons that are not consistent with the federal management plan; and

Whereas, numerous studies, including some funded by NOAA Fisheries, indicate that the greatest economic engine in the Gulf reef fishery is the recreational angling sector, and federal control should be relinquished to the Gulf states, which depend most on this vital public resource: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 85th Legislature of the State of Texas hereby encourage Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Texas to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to 200 nautical miles; and be it further

Resolved, That the Texas secretary of state forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and to the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

POM-157. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing the celebration of the Republic of China's (Taiwan) 106th National Day on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 103

Whereas, Relations between the Republic of China (Taiwan) and the United States are marked by strong bilateral trade, education, and cultural exchanges. In 2016, bilateral trade totaled more than \$65.4 billion in exchanged goods, making the U.S. the third-largest trading partner of Taiwan, and Taiwan the tenth-largest trading partner of the United States; and

Whereas, Taiwan and the state of Michigan have long benefited from this relationship. In 2016 Taiwan was Michigan's sixth-largest market in Asia and Michigan exports to Taiwan amounted to \$298.59 million, a 20 percent increase from 2015. From 2013 to 2016, Michigan imports from Taiwan increased from \$705 million to \$867 million, a 23 percent increase, making the outlook for joint economic and cultural growth in the future bright; and

Whereas, Taiwan is capable of and willing to fulfill its responsibilities and to collaborate with the world to deal with the challenges of humanitarian aids and disease control. Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations benefits the international community as a whole, including the state of Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body congratulate the government and people of the Republic of China

(Taiwan) on their 106th National Day on October 10, 2017; and be it further

Resolved, That we continue to support Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations which impact the health, safety and well-being of its people, and support its aspiration to make more contributions in international societies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of State; the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in Chicago Illinois; and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-158. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing their opposition to violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declaring these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 82

Whereas, The United States was founded on the principles that all men are created equal and have the unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In the more than 240 years since this declaration, our nation has strived, struggled, and made great progress toward achieving these lofty ideals. Ending slavery, women's suffrage, the civil rights movement, and marriage equality were all major moments in our history where we recognized injustice and inequality and worked to end it; and

Whereas, White nationalist and neo-Nazi groups endorse agendas that are in irreconcilable conflict with our nation's foundational principles of liberty and justice for all. Throughout the course of our nation's history, these groups have promoted intimidation and violent repression of individuals solely on the basis of their race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or immigration status; and

Whereas, Although white nationalism has attempted to reinvent itself, self-identifying as the "Alt-Right," its present-day rhetoric and terrorism conjure painful memories of our nation's past. Race-based hatred remains an integral component of these groups' core orientations as they seek to reignite social animosities, reverse improvements in race relations, divide the nation, and provoke hatred, classism, and ethnic eradication; and

Whereas, The white nationalist and neo-Nazi message of racial and social intolerance has led to senseless acts of violence that terrorize members of ethnic and religious minority communities. The tragic events that took place on August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, prove that white nationalism and neo-Nazism remain very real threats to social and racial progress and peace in our nation, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we strongly denounce and oppose the violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declare these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Governor, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-159. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan memorializing atomic veterans for their service and sacrifice for our nation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, Throughout the nation's history, brave Michigan citizens have answered the call of duty and service, defending our free-

dom as members of the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas, As a result of the Manhattan Project, the United States conducted the Trinity Atomic Test, the first detonation of a nuclear device, in New Mexico on July 16, 1945; and

Whereas, Over 200,000 American service members, including those from Michigan, participated in aboveground nuclear tests between 1945 and 1962, and veterans who participated in the cleanup of the Eniwetok Atoll in the Marshall Islands between 1977 and 1980, and also those who were part of the United States military occupation forces in or around Hiroshima and Nagasaki before 1946, and some were held as a prisoner of war during this time; and

Whereas, These atomic veterans were exposed to radiation during their military service and, due to that exposure, developed several types of medical conditions that are not currently listed under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA); and

Whereas, Many atomic veterans were prevented by secrecy laws or oaths from seeking medical care or disability compensation from the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for conditions they may have developed as a result of radiation exposure; and

Whereas, In 1996, the United States Congress repealed the Nuclear Radiation and Secrecy Agreements Act, freeing atomic veterans to describe their military involvement in nuclear testing in order to file for VA benefits; and

Whereas, Atomic veterans will now be eligible for free medical care from the VA and compensation in the form of full service-connected disability allowance, including payments to a surviving spouse or children; and

Whereas, The Michigan Veteran's Affairs Agency will provide free assistance to Michigan veterans and their dependents in developing and submitting disability compensation claims to the VA and the Department of Justice for death benefits; and

Whereas, The National Association of Atomic Veterans was formed in 1979 to help atomic veterans obtain medical care and assistance; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body find it proper and fitting that atomic veterans be recognized for their service and sacrifice for our nation and that they should be provided the necessary medical services and compensation for their service; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize the United States Congress to do all it can to support atomic veterans, their spouses, and dependents in receiving medical care and disability compensation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the National Associations of Atomic Veterans, the Michigan Veteran's Affairs Agency, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-160. A resolution adopted by the Township Council of Livingston, New Jersey, urging their delegation to the United States Congress to oppose any proposal to eliminate the state and local taxes deductibility provision from the Federal tax code; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2325. A bill to incentivize the hiring of United States workers in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2326. A bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2327. A bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2328. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay and death benefits in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 14

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 14, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes.

S. 792

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 792, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish an H-2B temporary non-agricultural work visa program, and for other purposes.

S. 915

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 915, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 918

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 918, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 1218

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to promote Federal employment for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1304

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1304, a bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude customary prompt pay discounts from manufacturers to wholesalers from the average sales price for drugs and biologicals under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide grants for access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1719

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to eliminate duties on imports of recreational performance outerwear, to establish the Sustainable Textile and Apparel Research Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1809

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1809, a bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Challenge Grant Program to promote technological innovation in our Nation's cities.

S. 2114

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2114, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 2173

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2173, a bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend State court funding for child welfare, and for other purposes.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. RES. 367

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 367, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its violence against demonstrators and calling for peaceful resolution to the concerns of the citizens of Iran.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2328. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay and death benefits in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pay Our Military Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2018, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018 are not in effect—

(1) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code), including reserve components thereof, who perform active service, including drill, during such period;

(2) such sums as are necessary for the payment of death benefits authorized by subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, for individuals who die during such period;

(3) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2); and

(4) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to contractors of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2).

(b) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

SEC. 3. TERMINATION.

Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in section 2; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) September 30, 2018.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1908. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the

United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1909. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1910. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1911. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1912. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1913. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1914. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1915. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1916. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MACHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1913 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 195, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1917. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

SA 1918. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1908. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO QUERY CERTAIN COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OBTAINED UNDER CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to conduct a query of information acquired under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) in an effort to find communications of or about a particular United

States person or a person inside the United States.

(b) CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a query for communications related to a particular United States person or person inside the United States if—

(1) such United States person or person inside the United States is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805, 1824, 1881b, and 1881d), or under title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

(2) the entity carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person or person inside the United States is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person;

(3) such United States person or person in the United States is a corporation; or

(4) such United States person or person inside the United States has consented to the query.

(c) QUERIES OF FEDERATED DATA SETS AND MIXED DATA.—In addition to subsection (a), none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to conduct a query of a data set, or of federated data sets, that includes any information acquired under Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a), unless the system has been configured to not return such information unless the officer or employee enters a code or other information indicating that—

(1) the person associated with the search term is not a United States person or person inside the United States; or

(2) if the person associated with the search term is a United States person or person inside the United States, one or more of the conditions of paragraph (2) is satisfied.

(d) MATTERS RELATING TO EMERGENCY QUERIES.—In the event that a query for communications related to a particular United States person or a person inside the United States is conducted pursuant to an emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or a physical search described in subsection (b)(1) and the application for such emergency authorization is denied, or in any other case in which the query has been conducted and no order is issued approving the query, none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used—

(1) to introduce or otherwise disclose information obtained or evidence derived from such query in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof; or

(2) to use or disclose information concerning any United States person acquired from such query in any other manner by Federal officers or employees without the consent of such person, except with the approval of the Attorney General if the information indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm to any person.

SA 1909. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Justice for activities that are not in compliance with the February 14, 2014, Department of Justice memorandum from James M. Cole, Deputy Attorney General, entitled "Guidance Regarding Marijuana Financial Crimes", and the memoranda incorporated therein.

SA 1910. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act to the Department of Justice may be used, with respect to any of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, to prevent the State from implementing State laws that authorize the use, distribution, possession, or cultivation of marijuana on non-Federal lands within the respective jurisdiction of the State.

SA 1911. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION F—NO BUDGET, NO PAY

SEC. 6001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "No Budget, No Pay Act".

SEC. 6002. DEFINITION.

In this division, the term "Member of Congress"—

(1) has the meaning given the term under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

SEC. 6003. TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

SEC. 6004. NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 6005.

(b) NO RETROACTIVE PAY.—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 6005, at any time after the end of that period.

SEC. 6005. DETERMINATIONS.

(a) SENATE.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6003 and whether Senators may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under section 6003; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 6003 and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under section 6003; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 6006. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This division shall take effect on February 1, 2019.

SA 1912. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AFFECTED BY A LAPSE IN APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1341 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "An officer" and inserting "Except as specified in this subchapter or any other provision of law, an officer"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c)(1) In this subsection—

"(A) the term 'covered lapse in appropriations' means any lapse in appropriations that begins on or after January 19, 2018; and

"(B) the term 'excepted employee' means an excepted employee or an employee performing emergency work, as such terms are defined by the Office of Personnel Management.

"(2) Each Federal employee furloughed as a result of a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for the period of the lapse in appropriations, and each excepted employee who is required to perform work during a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for such work, at the employee's standard rate of pay, at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates.

"(3) During a covered lapse in appropriations, each excepted employee who is required to perform work shall be entitled to use leave under chapter 63 of title 5, or any other applicable law governing the use of leave by the excepted employee, for which compensation shall be paid at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates."

SA 1913. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

EXTENSION OF CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

SEC. 101. The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division D of Public Law 115-56) is amended by striking the date specified in section 106(3) and inserting "January 20, 2018".

SA 1914. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE FOR VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES.

(a) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES.—During a funding gap impacting the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Veterans

Affairs, out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines necessary to continue to administer and provide benefits and services to veterans, dependents, and survivors provided under chapters 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, 23, 30, 31, 33, 35, and 39 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) **FUNDING GAP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “funding gap” means any period of time after the beginning of a fiscal year for which interim or full-year appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs for that fiscal year have not been enacted.

SA 1915. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY AND SUPPORTING CONTRACTOR PAY

SEC. —01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Ensuring Pay for Our Military Act”.

SEC. —02. EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS TO PROVIDE PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND SUPPORTING CIVILIAN AND CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL DURING FUNDING GAP IMPACTING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) **APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES.**—During a funding gap impacting the Armed Forces, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard), out of any amounts in the general fund of the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) determines to be necessary to continue to provide pay and allowances (without interruption) to the following:

(1) Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including reserve components thereof, who perform active service during the funding gap.

(2) At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, such civilian personnel of the Department of Defense who are providing support to the members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, such personnel of contractors of the Department of Defense who are providing direct support to the members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) **FUNDING GAP DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “funding gap” means any period of time after the beginning of a fiscal year for which interim or full-year appropriations for the personnel accounts of the Armed Forces for that fiscal year have not been enacted.

SA 1916. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY,

Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1913 submitted by Mr. SCHUMER and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE —CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. —01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Pay Our Military Act of 2018”.

SEC. —02. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAY AND DEATH BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are hereby appropriated for fiscal year 2018, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for any period during which interim or full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018 are not in effect—

(1) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to members of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code), including reserve components thereof, who perform active service, including drill, during such period;

(2) such sums as are necessary for the payment of death benefits authorized by subchapter II of chapter 75 of title 10, United States Code, for individuals who die during such period;

(3) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2); and

(4) such sums as are necessary to provide pay and allowances to contractors of the Department of Defense (and the Department of Homeland Security in the case of the Coast Guard) whom the Secretary concerned determines are providing support to members of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1) and in connection with the payment of benefits described in paragraph (2).

(b) **SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Secretary concerned” means—

(1) the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Department of Defense; and

(2) the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to matters concerning the Coast Guard.

SEC. —03. TERMINATION.

Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into

law of an appropriation (including a continuing appropriation) for any purpose for which amounts are made available in section 02; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable regular or continuing appropriations resolution or other Act without any appropriation for such purpose; or (3) September 30, 2018.

SA 1917. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 6 of the House Amendment Strike “February 16” and insert “February 8”

SA 1918. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment.”

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of David J. Ryder, of New Jersey, to be Director of the Mint for the Department of Treasury, dated January 19, 2018.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. TILLIS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL REGISTER PRINTING SAVINGS ACT OF 2017—Continued

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Joni Ernst, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, James Lankford, and Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Jones	Thune
Crapo	Kennedy	Tillis
Cruz	Lankford	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Wicker
Donnelly	McCaskill	Young
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Harris	Peters
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lee	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Flake	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my col-

leagues a part of the statement of the White House Press Secretary tonight, presumably on behalf of the administration. It simply says: We will not negotiate the status of unlawful immigrants while Democrats hold our lawful citizens hostage over their reckless demands.

That appropriately represents the White House view of where we are. And what we have just witnessed on the floor was a cynical decision by Senate Democrats to shove aside millions of Americans for the sake of irresponsible political gains. A government shutdown was 100 percent avoidable—completely avoidable. Now it is imminent, all because Senate Democrats chose to filibuster a noncontroversial funding bill that contains nothing, not a thing, they do not support—nothing they do not support.

Perhaps across the aisle some of our Democratic colleagues are feeling proud of themselves, but what has their filibuster accomplished? What has it accomplished? The answer is simple: their very own government shutdown.

The shutdown effects on the American people will come as no surprise. All week, as we have stood on the floor and begged our colleagues to come to their senses, Senate Republicans have described exactly what this will mean.

For America's men and women in uniform, shutting down the government means delayed pay. For the many thousands of civilian employees who support their missions, it means furloughs. And for the families of fallen heroes, it may well mean a freeze on survivor death benefits. For veterans who rely on our promise of care, shutting down the government means threatening their access to treatment. For so many Americans struggling with opioid addiction, the same is true. Thanks to the Democratic leader's decision to filibuster an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, low-income families will slip closer to losing health coverage for their kids, and in many States, this is an emergency.

I am having trouble understanding which one of these outcomes my Democratic colleagues could possibly be proud of. Which one of them? I think our friends on the other side took some bad advice—really bad advice. I would hate to have to be trying to explain this myself.

They ignored the Governors, including seven Democrats who wrote Congress begging us to extend SCHIP for 9 million children. They ignored the needs of millions of Americans who rely on the Federal Government for important services. They held all this hostage—all of this hostage over the completely unrelated issue of illegal immigration.

Republicans in the Senate have done all we can to continue the normal operations of the Federal Government and secure certainty for these SCHIP kids. We could pass it tonight, it could go to

the President for signature, and these kids would be OK.

Well, we are going to continue to do all we can. We will vote again so the American people know who stands for them. And when our friends across the aisle remember who it is they actually represent, we will be ready to come together in a bipartisan discussion that will be necessary to clean up all of this mess.

We have all been having private conversations here on the floor. Almost everybody on both sides doesn't understand how we ended up here, because most of the stuff, we agree on. Well, there is only one reason we ended up here: the shoe-horning of illegal immigration into this debate.

Now, having said that, there is a lot of sympathy in this body for doing something about the DACA kids. It is not like nobody is interested in that. We have been talking about it for 3 months. But the one reason we are where we are is because we couldn't close out any of these other component parts because our friends on the other side said: You have to deal with this issue. This issue is the key to getting defense spending, this issue is the key to getting help for SCHIP kids, and on and on and on.

I think most of the American people believe that shutting down the government over this issue, which doesn't even ripen until March, is irresponsible. And I have just listed all of the people who are going to be adversely impacted by this action.

So we are going to keep on voting, and the government may be heading into a shutdown, but the Senate is not shutting down. We are open to talk and to resolve this. I don't think it makes the institution look very responsible. The American people should expect better from us than this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, very sadly, we are on the precipice of a government shutdown. The majority leader only just allowed us to vote on a continuing resolution that he knew lacked the votes long before this hour. It is not just Democrats who oppose this CR; several Republicans did as well.

All of today, we have endeavored to reach an agreement with President Trump and the Republicans that would have not only spared a government shutdown but cemented an agreement on spending caps, including those for our military, the healthcare issues, disaster relief, and immigration issues.

President Trump reached out to me this morning to invite me to the White House to talk over all of these issues, and I accepted. We had a lengthy and substantive discussion. During the meeting, in exchange for strong DACA protections, I reluctantly put the border wall on the table for discussion. Even that was not enough to entice the President to finish the deal. Many Democrats don't want to go that far on

the border. Many Republicans don't either. But we were willing to compromise with the President to get an agreement. In the room, it sounded like the President was open to accept it. This afternoon, in my heart, I thought we might have a deal tonight. That was how far we had come. That is how positive our discussion felt. We had a good meeting, but what has transpired since that meeting in the Oval Office is indicative of the entire tumultuous and chaotic process Republicans have engaged in in the negotiations thus far.

Even though President Trump seemed to like an outline of a deal in the room, he did not press his party in Congress to accept it. Speaker RYAN and Leader MCCONNELL, without the commitment of the President, would not agree to accept anything either.

What happened to the President Trump who asked us to come up with a deal and promised that he would take heat for it? What happened to that President? He backed off at the first sign of pressure.

We had the outline of a deal on caps. We had the outline of a deal on healthcare. We had the outline of a deal on immigration, the toughest issue. It was real, and it was an honest-to-goodness breakthrough. We could have passed a short-term extension of funding so that we could cross the t's, dot the i's, and be done with it all, but the dynamic of the past few weeks during which the congressional Republicans looked to the President for guidance and the President provided none prevailed again today, unfortunately. The same chaos, the same disarray, the same division and discord on the Republican side that has been in the background of these negotiations for months unfortunately appears endemic, and it is standing in the way of bipartisan solutions to all of the issues now before us.

Every American knows the Republican Party controls the White House, the Senate, and the House. It is their job to keep the government open. It is their job to work with us on a way to move things forward. But they didn't reach out to us once on this CR—no discussion, no debate, nothing at all. It was produced without an ounce of Democratic input and dropped in our laps. Meanwhile, they can't even get on the same page as a party. They control every branch of the legislative process, and it is their responsibility to govern, and here they have failed.

Several Republicans voted against the CR, as well as Democrats, for the same reason we voted against it. One of the most serious consequences of having continuing resolution after continuing resolution is the damage it does to our military. As the Pentagon spokesman said last night, another CR would be wasteful and destructive to our military. The Navy Secretary said that because of CRs, "[the Navy has] put \$4 billion in the trash can, poured lighter fluid on it, and burned it." That

is the Navy Secretary—because of what you have done.

This is no way to conduct the Nation's business. Republicans know it. Democrats know it. The American people know that this party is not capable of governing.

So where do we go from here? I believe many of my Republican colleagues sincerely want to get a deal. I know their hearts are in the right place. I know they lament the fact that we now accept brinksmanship where bipartisanship used to be. In the past, there was always discussions on these issues. Everyone knew in the Senate you needed both parties to work together. None of that happened here today.

Now, all of this problem is because Republican leadership can't get to yes because President Trump refuses to.

President Trump, if you are listening, I am urging you, please take yes for an answer. The way things went today, the way you turned from a bipartisan deal, it is almost as if you were rooting for a shutdown, and now we will have one, and the blame should crash entirely on President Trump's shoulders.

This will be called a Trump shutdown. This will be called a Trump shutdown because there is no one—no one—who deserves the blame for the position we find ourselves in more than President Trump. He walked away from two bipartisan deals, including one today in which I even put the border wall on the table. What will it take for President Trump to say yes and learn how to execute the rudiments of government?

Tomorrow marks a year to the day President Trump took the oath of office on the Capitol steps. Unfortunately, a Trump shutdown would be a perfect encapsulation of the chaos he has unleashed on our government. Instead of bringing us all together, he has pulled us apart. Instead of governing from the middle, he has outsourced his Presidency to the extremes. Instead of living up to the great dealmaker he marketed himself to be, he has been the single driving force in scuttling bipartisan deals in Congress.

Now, at this late hour, his behavior is on the verge of grinding our government to a halt—a Trump shutdown. Democrats will continue to strive for a bipartisan agreement on all of the outstanding issues. I know there are men and women of good will on the other side of the aisle who are just as upset as I am with the direction we are headed in. I plead with them to see reason and prevail upon their leaders—and most of all the President—to give us the space to work together, to let us do the job the American people sent us here to do.

When President Trump decides he is finally ready to lead his party to a deal, Democrats will be ready, willing, and eager to clinch it. There is a path forward. We can reach it quickly.

Tomorrow, the President and the four leaders should immediately sit

down and finish this deal so the entire government can get back to work on Monday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to particularly commend the five Democrats who voted not to shut the government down. The new Senator from Alabama, during his campaign, said it was important to fund the S-CHIP program before it ran out of money, and he listened to the seven Democratic Governors who said: This is an emergency; we need help.

There were five courageous Democrats on the other side who stood up to this ridiculous argument that it made sense somehow to shut down the government over an illegal immigration issue that the vast majority of this body would like to do something about anyway.

I want to particularly commend the five Democrats who had the courage to stand up to this ridiculous strategy that put their whole party in an incredible predicament because, as the White House just indicated, the President is not going to talk about the issue at all while the government is shut down. He made it quite clear. He said: "When Democrats start paying our armed forces and first responders, we will reopen negotiations on immigration reform."

So this particular strategy has eliminated the possibility of getting a signature on the thing they shut the government down over. Can anybody explain to me this strategy? I am perplexed. I wasn't first in my class, but I wasn't last either. How does this get them what they are looking for?

We will continue to talk because when all the games stop, the issues are still there—every single one of them are still there. The American people expect us to act like adults, to get together and solve the problems.

Now I will be offering an amendment to change the date to February 8. We will, unfortunately, not be able to get that vote tonight, but I will be subsequently asking for consent, but at some point here, we will be voting on February 8. That is the date the senior Senator from South Carolina and I have been talking about, and the Democratic leader and I have been talking about—which begins to move a little bit closer to where our friends on the other side said they wanted to be—but a reasonable period of time that takes into account the State of the Union, our party conferences, and the amount of time it takes to actually write a bill once you have an agreement. You can't just reach an agreement, snap your fingers, and everything falls into place and you are ready to go. It is a reasonable period to first agree, and then write, get ready to negotiate a settlement that we have been working on for months. February 8 is a very reasonable time. I hear there is sentiment for that on both sides of the aisle. I hope so.

At some point, we will vote on that option. I can't get that vote tonight, but I am going to ask consent to have that vote tonight.

VOTE ON MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT
NO. 1905

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Perdue
Boozman	Grassley	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Jones	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Wicker
Enzi	McCaskill	Young
Ernst	McConnell	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Nelson	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT
NO. 1903

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to concur with further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1917

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, with an amendment numbered 1917.

The amendment is as follows:

On Page 1, line 6 of the House Amendment Strike "February 16" and insert "February 8"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur with a further amendment in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, John Kennedy, John Hoeven, John Thune, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Lisa Murkowski, Susan M. Collins, Bill Cassidy, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, James E. Risch, Johnny Isakson.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1918

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 195 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions, amendment numbered 1918.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This act shall be effective 1 day after enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the mandatory quorum call be waived and the Senate immediately vote on the motion to invoke cloture without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1301

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, this shouldn't take very long.

I was most disappointed tonight when the President of the United States put out a statement that tried to divide us based on party when it came to support of our military. There is no such division. Everyone in this Chamber knows it. So, as we have in other instances where we have had a

shutdown—I remember, in 2013, we did this right off the bat. I want to make sure that tonight we send a very clear signal that we don't want one moment to pass with there being any uncertainty that any soldier anywhere in the world will be paid for the valiant work they do on behalf of our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk, providing for continuing appropriations for pay and death benefits for members of the Armed Services, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we passed similar legislation during the government shutdown back in 2013. My hope is that we can restore funding for the entire government before this becomes necessary. I am going to object for tonight, but we will discuss it again tomorrow. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1301

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, many of us have participated over the last few hours in several conversations trying to bring the parties together, and, indeed, a lot of movement has occurred. There seems to be one substantial issue remaining in which things could come together. So I am going to ask that we delay the shutdown for at least 1 day.

Most of us on this floor do not want a shutdown. Since there were discussions here in earnest in a bipartisan way, we ought to give those discussions a chance to bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk that would provide for a continuing resolution to fund the government through Saturday, January 20, 2018, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1301

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I had the feeling at one point in time tonight that we were very, very close to an agreement. I think, as we look around this body, we see folks on both sides of the aisle who want to come to an agreement and will work hard for an agreement.

It is a fact that we need a better budget. We need a budget that works for America. We need a budget that goes to the end of the fiscal year, which isn't that long from now, by the way—only the end of September. It is a fact that we need CHIP funding and money for our community health centers, certainly for our military, and money for the northern and southern borders and for opioids and the list goes on.

The majority leader has said that they have been working on a budget settlement for weeks. I think most of us, if not all of us, are willing to stay here and work until this work gets done. I am certainly willing to.

This is supposed to be the most deliberative body in the world. I know that some will say there is just not enough time, but there is. I have watched this body work very quickly when necessary. I think a government shutdown would require that.

We have pushed this budget off now for 112 days. That is why I am proposing a 3-day continuing resolution so we can work together to come to a conclusion to do what the American people want; that is, have a budget that works until the end of the fiscal year that funds critical programs for our military and domestic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 36, H.R. 1301; that the amendment at the desk that would provide for a continuing resolution to fund the government through Monday, January 22, 2018, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all our colleagues, the Senate will convene at 12 noon tomorrow.

My hope is that an agreement can be reached. We will be here in session tomorrow working to finally resolve the way forward. Senators should expect votes tomorrow.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Saturday, Janu-

ary 20; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:28 a.m., adjourned until Saturday, January 20, 2018, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EDWARD CHARLES PRADO, OF TEXAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CARL P. BHEND
KUN J. CHANG
SARRA E. CUSHEN
MICHAEL L. EINHORN
SUZANA M. GJEKAJ
AARON B. HARDING
CHRISTOPHER R. JORDAN
ROBERT B. KIM
JEREMY B. LAKE
STEPHEN P. LAMBERT
GARY S. MAYNE
JAMES P. MURPHY
STEPHEN S. POTTER
ANITA M. SHADE
DEMITRI VILLARREAL
THOMAS K. WEBER
CHRISTOPHER M. WOLBERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

STEVEN J. ACEVEDO
JOHAN K. AHN
ANTOIN M. ALEXANDER
JONATHAN L. ARNHOLT
RICHARD J. BARNETT
JOHN P. BARON
LAURA M. BAUGH
BRADLEY J. BOETIG
KAREN E. BOWMAN
MICHELLE R. BROWN
GLENN D. BURNS
CHRISTINE L. CAMPBELL
ELIZABETH A. CASSTEVEN
NATHAN D. CECAVA
ERIC M. CHUMBLEY
JOHNATHAN M. COMPTON
AMY A. COSTELLO
ROBERT M. CROMER
RICHARD L. DAGROSA
STEVEN W. DAVIS
PAUL T. DEFLORIO
AN T. DUONG
GEOFFREY L. EWING
ERIC M. FLAKE
HEIDI L. GADDEY
SANJAY A. GOGATE
ALAN D. GUHLKE
MARSHALL T. HAYES
KEVIN D. HETTINGER
AQUILLA L. HIGSMITH TYLER
JOSHUA A. HODGE
DAVID T. HSIEH
JULIA C. JACKSON
MARIA R. J. LAHTI
PETER A. LEARN
JEFFREY D. LEWIS

ROBERT J. LOVE
PATRICIA A. MACSPARRAN
SHELLY D. MARTIN
STEPHEN C. MATURO
MARIEFRANCE M. MCINTEE
RYAN G. K. MIHATA
MARSHA D. MITCHUM
SHAWN D. NICHOLS
JON J. OPRY
LUIS B. OTERO
JOHN C. ROCKWELL
GREENE D. ROYSTER IV
LUKE B. SIMONET
BARTON C. STAAT
ADAM M. STARR
KARA M. VANDEKIEFT
WENDI E. WOHLTMANN
LESLIE A. WOOD
TORY W. WOODARD
HEATHER C. YUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

NATALIYA A. ABLES
OMAR S. AHMED
ANDREW J. AMACK
MICHAEL R. ARGYLE
SUMIT S. BAGGA
GREGORY A. BAKER
NICOLE C. BAKER
MATTHEW G. BALDERSTON
AUSTIN R. BALTENSPERGER
KATHERINE A. BANARES
AUSTIN N. BARBER
SARAH J. BARNETTE
JOSEPH A. BAXTER
JASON A. BEACHLER
BRADLEY W. BEELER
ANGEL Z. BELGARD
KAREN A. BELLINI
RICHARD J. BENNETT
JOHN L. BENNION
BRIAN C. BENTELE
JACOB R. BERRY
AMIT BHARDWAJ
PREETINDER S. BHULLAR
JEREMY V. BIGHAM
SARA S. BIRDSONG
CAROLINE A. BOLDUC
PETER N. BONNEAU
CLINTON J. BORCHARDT
GRIGORI G. BOULDO
JARED G. BRINKERHOFF
MATTHEW J. BROWN
SAMANTHA E. BROWN
CARL BRYCE
KAREN G. BUCHER
JASON A. BURCHETT
PAUL H. BUTLER
SHAUNA M. BUTLER
ROBERT R. BYRNE
STEPHEN D. CAGLE, JR.
JONATHAN J. CAMPBELL
PHILIP A. CANNADY
MICHAEL J. CARCHEDI
KATHERINE M. CARLIN
GEOFFREY S. CARLSON
PATRICIA K. CATROW
MATTHEW J. CELLINI
MICHAEL J. CHIAPPONE
CHAD T. CHRISTENSEN
ELLE S. CLEAVES
PHILIP G. CLERC
KELLY E. CLINTONCIRROCCO
JOSHUA A. COKER
JASON A. CROSKREY
JENNIFER A. CROSS
MICHELLE A. CUNNINGHAM
DAVID N. DADO
MICHAELA J. DAGUON
BRADLEY R. DAYTON
MAURICIO DE CASTRO PRETEL
KATLIN P. DEBBINK
STEPHANIE A. DEGEN
CHRISTOPHER B. DELANGE
SARA M. DESPAIN
SARAH M. DITCH
CHAD R. DOUGLAS
DAVID J. DOWNEY
KIMBERLY M. DUARTE
JENNIFER A. DUNN
ROBERT J. EDMONDS
GEORGE S. EDWARDS, JR.
JOSEPH L. EINHORN
WILLIAM S. ELLIS
JENNIFER R. ENMAN BOURGON
DANIEL C. ENSLEY
STEPHEN P. ERLACH
ANGELINA J. ESCANO
OSCAR J. ESCANO
JARRETT J. EYER
NICOLE S. FANNING
MATTHEW J. FEELEY
PAUL W. FERNANDES
JASON E. FISHER
EMILY J. FLETCHER
CHRISTOPHER D. FONTMAYOR
JASON T. FORBUSH
BRENT D. FORREST
ANDREW L. FRANKLIN
ASHLEY J. FUKUOKA
MICHAEL C. GALANTE
STEVEN W. GALE
KARA W. GARCIA

APRIL L. A. GARING
 PAUL A. GARRETT
 MELANIE B. GATES
 ZACHARY J. GENANT
 JAMES H. GENTRY
 ZACHARY A. GIBSON
 ELIZABETH M. GOLDEN
 KEVIN T. GOULD
 CAROLINE M. GREEN
 MATTHEW W. GREENE
 ANDREW J. GROBERG
 ESTHER L. GUARD
 MARIYA GUSMAN
 TAYLOR A. HAHN
 MATTHEW S. HAMM
 SALLY HAMM
 ERIN R. HANLIN
 DEREK S. HATCH
 ADAM T. HAUSSLER
 REBECCA W. HAYES
 SETH W. HEIMER
 ANTONIA R. HELBLING
 JONATHAN D. HENDERSON
 JUSTIN D. HESER
 NORMAN L. HESSER
 COURTNEY N. HINTZ
 LAUREN C. B. HITE
 MICHELLE L. HOBBS
 ALLEN R. HOLMES
 STEPHEN M. HORRAS
 ADAM M. HOTZ
 MATTHEW J. HUBBARD
 GARRETT W. HUCK
 SCOTT T. HULSE
 JOHN C. HUNNINGHAKE
 CHARLES L. HUTCHINGS
 JANE S. HWANG
 ELIAS N. HYDRICK
 DOREEN O. JACKSON
 AMANDA L. JAINCHILL
 MEGHAN L. JARMAN
 RACHEL JEANTY
 TYLER W. KALLSEN
 SCOTT D. KASER
 DEVIN C. KELLY
 ANDREA M. KEOHANE
 AMANDA N. KILLINGER
 DOMINIC C. KIM
 JARED D. KIRKLAND
 DACRE R. T. KNIGHT
 MATTHEW D. KOLOK
 COURTNEY R. KONKEL
 ANN M. KRONENWETTER
 JEFFREY S. KURZ
 MARK A. LAMSON
 MICHAEL A. LANG
 ALEXANDER T. LE
 LAUREN E. M. LEE
 NICOLE R. LEONARD
 BENJAMIN S. LEVY
 BRIAN S. LIDDELL
 MATTHEW H. LINDSEY
 CLAYTON L. LIVELY
 ANDREW M. LONG
 BRIT J. LONG
 LEIF E. MAGNUSSON
 KATHERINE L. MALCZEWSKI
 JESSICA M. MALONE
 JORDAN K. MARSHALL
 KEISHA D. MARTIN
 IAN S. MATTHEWS
 PHILLIP J. MATTHEWS
 JOHN P. MAWN
 MICHAEL A. MCCORMICK
 KYLE R. MCINTOSH
 CHANTELL R. MCKEE
 NICHOLAS A. MCKENZIE
 CONNOR B. MCKEOWN
 BRIAN C. MCMULLIN
 PHILLIP M. MCPEAK
 ANTHONY J. MEEHAN
 JOSEPH M. MIGLIURI
 BENJAMIN D. MILLER
 PAUL R. MILLER
 JASON A. MINER
 MILTON B. MIRANDA ROSA
 LAUREN C. MITCHELL
 JESSE W. MIX
 NICHOLAS K. MOLBY
 PRESTON S. MOORE
 AARON O. MORGAN
 ANDREW C. MORTON
 JOSIAH MOULTON
 MATTHEW J. MUSCARA
 DAVID J. MYERS
 BENJAMIN A. NAPIER
 DANIEL R. NASSERY
 LEAH N. NAVE
 TRACY N. NELSON
 PHONG T. NGO
 ALEXANDER H. D. NGUYEN
 NHU A. T. NGUYEN
 GARRETT NORTON
 JAMES T. NUGENT
 ADAM F. OBAIDI
 JOSHUA J. OBHOLZ
 AUSTIN J. OETKEN
 JACQUELINE M. OKANE
 ALEX C. OVERMILLER
 ALEXANDER T. PARAS
 CRAIG S. PEDERSEN
 REBECCA L. PEEBLES
 SHANNEAL A. PEGRAM
 ANDREW J. PELLEGRINI
 PHILIPPINE D. PERALTA
 ROSS F. PINSON
 WHITNEY L. POLLARD

KIMBERLY E. PORTALE
 WILLIAM M. PRYOR
 SARAH A. PULLEN
 MITCHELL J. RADIGAN
 ROBERT RAKOSI
 RUSTIN A. RAWLINGS
 ERIN E. REDDIS
 EVAN J. RICHARDS
 JANINE C. RICHARDSON
 DAVID C. ROGERS
 PATRICK D. SAAS
 RAMIN SADEGHI
 ELLIOTT J. SALLY
 SANDRA M. SALZMAN
 CHRISTOPHER D. SANDERS
 CONG Z. SANTOSO
 CHRISTOPHER J. SARDON
 ERIC E. SCHOTT
 KENNETH P. SEASTEDT
 ALEC J. W. SHARP
 AMANDA R. SHAUB
 MICHAEL A. SHAUB
 CAMERON M. SHAWVER
 JAMES T. SHEN
 XIAOMING SHI
 MERYL A. SIMON LOGAN
 ERICA M. SIMON
 SAMANTHA G. SIMPSON
 KATHERINE M. SLOGIC
 JOSEPH C. SMATHERS
 ALEXANDRA J. SMITH
 ELIZABETH R. SMITH
 DREW W. SMITHERS
 TIMOTHY A. SOEKEN
 JEFFREY A. SORENSEN
 JOSE M. SOSA
 JOHN D. STACEY
 DOUGLAS M. STEIN
 BRIAN N. STEINER
 BRIAN D. STEPHENS
 KELLY M. STONEHAM
 JEAN V. STOREY
 JORDAN T. STOUFFER
 JEREMY M. STROHMAYER
 JOSEPH C. STUART
 CHENGHUI SU
 KENNETH L. TANYI
 ALAN D. TATE
 JOSHUA M. TATE
 AARON C. THOMAS
 JONATHAN O. THOMAS
 SPENCER D. THOMAS
 RICHARD S. THORSTED
 EMILY M. TIBBITS
 VINCENT G. TICHENOR
 JODIE K. TIMBERLAKE
 WILLIAM T. TIMBERLAKE
 SCOTT A. TONDER
 JONATHAN D. TOPHAM
 DAVID K. TREFFLICH
 STEVEN D. TRIGG
 ANNA S. TRIKHACHEVA
 IAN S. TUZNICK
 COLBY C. UPTGRAFT
 MATTHEW J. VARGAS
 JEFFREY T. VASSALLI, JR.
 DOUGLAS B. WALTON
 STEVEN B. WALTON
 HEIDI N. WELCH
 RYAN M. WEST
 CHRISTOPHER R. WILD
 DAVID J. WILDT
 BRIAN C. WOLF
 HEATHER L. WOLFE
 RICHARD M. WOOD
 ADAM N. WORK
 BART D. WORTHINGTON
 RANDALL S. YALE
 ADAM N. YOUNG
 JOHN J. YUN
 MICHELLE L. ZIELINSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GEORGE Z. ABERTH
 KEVIN R. ADAMS
 DAVID Y. AHN
 JULIE A. ANDERSON
 DENYS ANDRIYENKO
 VINCENT W. ARCHER
 ANDREW P. BENFIELD
 SCOTT A. BRYANT
 AUSTIN R. CARR
 DANIEL F. CHARTRAND
 JENNA L. CHASE
 BRANDON CHAVEZ
 KIEN K. CHIBAYERE
 CODY J. CHRISTENSEN
 COLEMAN K. CHRISTENSEN
 JESSICA M. DEFazio
 SARAH E. DEVEAUX
 JOHN E. DINAN
 ELLEN M. DONOHUE
 SAMUEL N. DURHAM
 ADAM J. EICHLER
 CALER J. FRICK
 TYLER B. GARRETT
 DWAYNE R. GENTRY
 JOHN D. GERHAUSER
 BRENNAN M. GOODWIN
 MICHAEL GU
 RYAN R. GUSTAFSON
 PEHRSON A. HAWKLEY
 CAROLYN R. HETRICK

CHRISTOPHER B. HINAHON
 HANS C. IGOU
 ASHLEY E. IVEY
 KEVIN E. KEMARLY
 HILLARY R. KEY
 HYUNGJOO T. KIM
 CINDY L. LAN
 SEUNG Y. LEE
 NICHOLAS S. LIEB
 JEFFREY D. LOBERG
 JOHN R. LOVELL
 MEGAN E. MILBURN
 CHRISTIANNA L. MOORE
 JENS D. NELSON
 HEATHER D. NORTON
 ROSS K. OATES
 THOMAS J. OCONNOR
 BENJAMIN J. PASS
 HEATHER E. PRATHER
 PAUL T. PRYOR
 MICHAEL R. REDISKE
 CANDICE M. REITER
 SARAH M. RINGDAHL
 STEVEN SAVAGE
 BRANDON J. SEUBERT
 LUCAS L. SHEPPARD
 EVAN M. SHIPP
 ALISHA C. SIMMONS
 DEREK R. SNARE
 MICHAEL W. STRUTHERS
 MELISSA S. THOMAS
 ANDREW L. THOMASSON
 CHRISTOPHER L. TRACY
 JOHN M. VANN
 DAVID T. WELCH
 ERIN G. WYRICK
 VERANIKA ZAKHARYEVA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
 FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

KEVIN D. ALFORD
 NATHAN S. ANDERSON
 PETER A. BALDWIN
 SCOTT D. BARNES
 JEFFREY G. BELISLE
 CRAIG S. BERG, JR.
 HALTON W. BEUMER
 ANDREW G. BOSTON
 MICHAEL BREWER
 KIMBERLY K. BROUGHTON
 ALLISON R. BUELL
 OMAR L. CABAN
 DAVID R. CARLSEN
 SHIHSHANG CHENG
 STEPHEN B. CHIPMAN
 DANIEL X. CHOI
 JOONE H. CHOI
 REBECCA A. CHRISTI
 RICHARD A. CLARK
 JAMES D. COVELLI
 JEAN M. COVELLO
 JASON W. CROMAR
 RETASHA S. DABNEY
 SONJA I. DARDENELLE
 BRETT W. DAVIES
 RYAN E. DAVIS
 MARK L. DEARDEN
 ROBERT M. DEWITT
 EMANUEL DIAZALONSO
 ELIZABETH A. DWYER
 STEPHEN B. EDSTROM
 ANTHONY C. ESCHLIMAN
 ERIN E. EZZELL
 BRENT A. FELDT
 PHILIP FLATAU
 RODERICK W. FONTENETTE
 AVEN W. FORD
 JUSTIN P. FOX
 ELIZABETH M. GAIDA
 KATHRYN K. GARNER
 KATHRYN T. GATTONE
 STARRINA A. IANELLONI
 MATTHEW D. GRAHAM
 ROSS F. GRAHAM
 AARON D. GRANT
 HEATHER M. HANCOCK
 JONI K. HODGSON
 JUSTIN R. HOLLON
 CHARLES T. HOWARD
 ANDREA W. JOHNSON
 LINDA B. JONES
 STEPHEN A. KUJANSUU
 DAVID B. LEARY
 TOBY F. LEES
 FREDILYN M. LIPATA
 CARRIE A. R. LITKE WAGER
 KEVIN C. LOH
 RICHARD K. LUGER
 STEPHEN E. R. LYBECK
 BRANDY E. LYTTLE
 MARK E. LYTLE
 JOSEPH K. MADRY
 MICHAEL H. MADSEN
 SEAN N. MARTIN
 JASON C. MCCARTHY
 CATHERINE H. MCHUGH
 JASON D. MERRELL
 DANIEL S. MICSUNESCU
 BRENT R. MITTELSTAEDT
 STEPHANIE A. MORRISON
 DAVID M. NAYEL
 ANJELI K. NAYAR
 TARA I. NEELEY
 LISA M. NICHOLSON

UZOAMAKA O. NWOYE
THAD F. OCAMPO
CRYSTAL M. PALMATIER
MICHAEL F. PARSONS
CHELSEA B. PAYNE
GABRIEL C. PEPPER
MATTHEW A. PIEPER
ELIZABETH S. PIETRALCZYK
ERIC R. PITTMAN
SHEA M. PRIBYL
FLORENCE V. QUINATA
MATTHEW H. RAMAGE
KYLE A. RICKARD
JACOB F. RIIS
RAMON A. RIOJAS
SIMON A. RITCHIE
ANDREW Y. ROBINSON
MELISSA M. RUNGE
TRAVIS C. RUSSELL
VALERIE G. SAMS
JEREL D. SCARBERRY
ELIZABETH R. SCHNAUBELT
JONATHAN W. SCHWAKE
WILLIAM H. SCOTT, JR.
WILLIAM A. SCROGGS III
LAUREEN H. SHEYPUK
MONICA M. SICKLER
CHRISTY R. SINE
ARIC D. STEINMANN
BENJAMIN M. STERMOLE
MICHELLE M. STODDARD
RORY P. STUART
MARION M. SWALL
TEDMOND C. W. SZETO
STEVEN W. THORPE
RUSSELL C. TONTZ III
JOHN W. TUEPKER
JOSHUA A. TYLER
ERIC C. UMBREIT
ERIC R. VAILLANT
DAVID E. VIZURRAGA
KRISTIN L. N. VOGT
JASON A. WAUGH
ROBERT S. WEATHERWAX
MATTHEW D. WEIRATH
JESSE M. WICKHAM
WINNIFRED M. WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ANN E. ALEXANDER
CLIFTON W. BAILEY
CLAYTON G. HICKS
JOANNA S. MCPHERSON
MASOUD MILANI
PATRICK B. PARSONS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10,
U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ANDREW A. ARNDT
JOHN C. BARNES
DANIEL R. BEAUDRY
CHAD K. BRINTON
ANDREW J. BROWELL
MATTHEW T. BRYAN
THOMAS P. BURNHAM
JOHN T. CASTLEN
CHRISTOPHER M. CHATELAIN
YAN CLERMONT
CHASE C. CLEVELAND
KEVIN S. COBLE
JASON C. COFFEY
JACK B. COHEN
CHRISTINA K. COLCLOUGH
DANA E. COOK
DEREK M. COYNE
MICHAEL T. DAVIS
PHILLIP J. DICKERSON
JOSHUA G. DIMKOFF
CHARLES B. DIXON
CHRISTOPHER D. ELDER
AUSTIN L. FENWICK
JENNA C. FERRELL
TIMOTHY J. L. FITZGIBBON
EDWARD J. GLADDING
MICHAEL A. GOLD
BRENT R. HABLEY
DANIEL W. HANCOCK
MAURA C. H. HOFFMAN
RONSON P. HONEYCHURCH
COLBY P. HOROWITZ
CASEY G. JONES
KEVIN M. JUNIUS
BARBARA K. KERRANE
JAMES S. KIM
NICOLE M. KIM
SUSAN KIM
ALAN S. KIRK
NATHAN S. LEW
JOYCE C. LIU
NICHOLAS A. LUCCHETTI
ROBERT D. LUYTIES
SEAN P. MAHARD
JONATHAN S. MARSHALL
AARON K. MCCARTNEY
TIMOTHY M. MCCULLOUGH
JASON M. MCKENNA
ROBERT H. MEEK
ALEXANDER MORNINGSTAR
DUSTIN B. MYRIE
SARAH E. NEALEN
JENNIFER D. NORVELL
TIMOTHY R. OLLIGES
JARED V. OLSON
DAVID J. PARDO
ELLIOT J. PERNULA
SHAWN J. PETERSON
AMANDA G. PRESSON
HANNAH E. PURKEY
JASON A. QUINN
STEVEN R. QUINZEL
ROBERT J. RAUCKHORST, JR.

DOUGLAS A. REISINGER
SCOTT C. REITOR
ALEC P. RICE
TRAVIS P. ROBERTS
MARK T. ROBINSON
WILLIAM M. ROTHSTEIN
ERIC A. RUDIE
ANNE W. SAVIN
VINCENT S. SCALFANI
ERIK B. SMITH
JORDAN C. STAPLEY
AMY R. STONE
JAVIER TALAVERA
DAVID A. THOMPSON
JOSHUA J. TOOMAN
DEVEREAUX X. TOWNER
JUSTIN W. ULRICH
ANNEMARIE P. E. VAZQUEZ
THOMAS G. WARSCHESFSKY
TODD A. WAYNE
JONATHAN J. WELLEMAYER
BRANDON O. WEST
JEFFREY H. WHYTE
WILLIAM T. WICKS
REGINA R. WIND
ADAM S. WOLRICH
D013347

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

TYLER M. ABERCROMBIE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RANDOLPH S. CARPENTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SEC-
TIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ANGEL SOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW C. DAWSON
LEE C. NOVY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ERIC C. CORRELL

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING DR. GERALD BROWN

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Gerald Brown on his retirement after forty-four years of distinguished service to his country and community as a Professor of Operations Research at the Naval Postgraduate School, located in my district on the central coast of California.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, Dr. Brown has demonstrated deep commitment to our nation and its values. After receiving his M.B.A. in Quantitative Methods from California State University, Fullerton in 1969, he went on to complete a Ph.D. in Mathematical Methods at the University of California, Los Angeles in 1974. While working on his doctorate, he concurrently completed Naval Officer Candidate School, graduating with the rank of Ensign in 1973.

After his education and training, Dr. Brown began to work as an Assistant Professor of Operations Research at the Naval Postgraduate School. He has committed his entire teaching career to training the next generation of our nation's naval officers at the Naval Postgraduate School, earning countless awards and accolades that reflect his dedication. Over the past forty-four years, Dr. Brown has taught the principles of operations research and computer science to thousands of officers from the U.S. military and allied nations. Former students include astronauts, Admirals, and even former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen.

The accolades earned by Dr. Brown include the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Medal, the highest honor that the Secretary of the Navy can bestow upon a civilian who demonstrates extraordinary service in their post. Dr. Brown also has three patents under his name owned by the federal government, and was the first professor from the Naval Postgraduate School to be accepted into the National Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Gerald Brown's devotion to his work and impressive accomplishments will be remembered by all who have worked with him at the Naval Postgraduate School, and the work of his students will serve as an enduring legacy. I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating Dr. Brown's body of work, and congratulating him on a well-earned retirement.

MACCABI USA MEN'S SOCCER
TEAM

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Maccabi USA men's soccer

team for competing in the USA 2018 King Cup tournament in Las Vegas, Nevada to honor our great American hero Martin Luther King, Jr.

Twenty men from Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania achieved an undefeated record of 4 wins, no losses and 2 draws, scoring 15 goals and allowing 6 against to earn the silver medal in the 2018 King Cup. The team consisted of the following individuals: Scott Agran, David Alhadeff, Gary (Gazza) Bernstein (Cptn.), Bob Boone, Scott Cohen, Jeff Cohn, Ed Harris, Stuart Hochberger (Cptn.), Dan (Indy) Indech, Don Kent, Ken Kramer, Ramin Lalezari, Jess Mogul, David Parks, Keith Silverman, David Stone, Lawrence Swerner, Mark (Wiz) Wisnevit, and was managed by Steve (Goldy) Goldenring and Dan Kurtz.

Maccabi USA is a 501c(3) not-for-profit organization with an extensive history of enriching Jewish lives through athletic, cultural and educational programs. Maccabi USA supports Jewish athletic endeavors enhanced by cultural and educational opportunities in the United States, Israel and throughout the world. These 20 men exemplify this great ideal.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Maccabi USA men's soccer team for their dedication, hard work and competitive spirit.

THANKING FRANCIS "FRANK"
RUSSO

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Frank Russo for his service to his country.

Frank Russo was born and raised on Staten Island. It was there where he graduated from Monsignor Farrell High School in 1991. He then matriculated at St. John's University where he graduated in 1995, receiving his Bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice. After college, Frank was admitted to the U.S. Customs Service under their Outstanding Scholar Program. After serving in U.S. Customs and Border Protection as a Deputy Field Coordinator and Assistant Director, he was eventually promoted to the position of Port Director for John F. Kennedy International Airport.

As Port Director, Frank has worked closely with the NYPD to combat the nation's opioid epidemic. In his first year, his team successfully intercepted over 80 shipments of fentanyl. Moreover, under his watch, Customs and Border Protection agents seized large batches of narcotics 14,000 times. Additionally, they seized \$9 million in currency linked to terrorism, drug trafficking, and other illegal activities. With 1,700 trained and devoted officers, Frank is truly on the front line in keeping our nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Frank Russo for his outstanding service to our country. He

and his agents not only stop crime in its tracks, but keep us safe as well. I am tremendously proud to represent him in Congress.

COMMEMORATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF MASON DISTRICT HOSPITAL

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Mason District Hospital of Havana, Illinois, as it celebrates its 60th anniversary. Their tireless work provides critical resources to our community in Central Illinois.

Mason District Hospital was founded in 1957 with a mission to provide the highest quality healthcare to its surrounding communities. Since then, the Hospital has grown alongside our community to provide high quality care in the face of an ever changing healthcare landscape. As a rural critical access hospital, Mason District Hospital is immensely important to the hard-working people of Mason County and the surrounding area. Its demonstrable success in fulfilling the needs of its patients for so many years is admirable and worthy of recognition.

Mason District Hospital has served thousands of Americans in their most desperate and vulnerable times. Their great reputation is known throughout Illinois and it is an honor to represent them in Congress. Congratulations to Mason District Hospital for sixty successful years, and here's to many more. Thank them for all that they do.

IN RECOGNITION OF VISITING
STUDENTS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the civic minded young men from The Hun School of Princeton who visited the Capitol. I would like to honor Headmaster Jonathan G. Brougham and Head of Middle School Kenneth J. Weinstein for their service and sacrifice to benefit the lives of youth. In a world where there is so much uncertainty, it is important to educate students to be mindful individuals who are aware of the trials of the less fortunate, and who seek to benefit the lives of all fellow citizens. I am confident that under the direction of these distinguished educators, these students will be molded into strong leaders who are ready to take on the world and whatever opportunities lie ahead. As a member of Congress, I view there is no better way to guarantee a strong future for America than to instill in our young people the values of service, sacrifice, and compassion.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

With their visit today, walking through the same hallways as our nation's forefathers and learning from their inspiration, I am confident the future of our country will be in good hands.

HONORING INTEGRATED WOOD COMPONENTS, INC.

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Integrated Wood Components, Inc. (IWCI) of Deposit, New York for being named "Local Business of the Year" by the Deposit Chamber of Commerce. Founded by the Kamp Family in 1972, IWCI has become an industry leader in composite wood furniture manufacturing through their commitment to producing quality products in an efficient and environmentally conscious way. This recognition is a true testament to IWCI's continued legacy of innovation, community involvement, and environmental stewardship.

Boasting one of the most modern, energy efficient, and fully integrated wood components manufacturing plants in the country, IWCI is known for its cutting-edge operation, swift adaptation to consumer needs, and technological advancements. The "Local Business of the Year" award, however, is a special designation reserved for those businesses we hold above and beyond demonstrating exemplary business practices. In the 19th District, community involvement and conserving our cherished outdoor spaces are priorities we hold dear, and IWCI is no exception to that. From aiding local community organizations to embracing environmentally-sensitive practices, IWCI is a bulwark of community and environmental sustainability.

For over forty years, IWCI has left a positive imprint on our Upstate community and economy. On behalf of New York's 19th District, I want to congratulate the Kamp Family on their many years of hard work and community service, and celebrate IWCI on its much-deserved award. I am grateful for the Kamp family's commitment to New York State, and I wish them and IWCI continued success.

HONORING MARGARET C. BARRETT-SIMON

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant. A life-long Jacksonian, Margaret C. Barrett-Simon graduated from St. Joseph High School and the University of Southern Mississippi.

She was first elected to the Jackson City Council in 1985. During her years of experience on the Council, she has served as President, Vice President, and Chair of the Planning Committee, Budget Committee, Rules Committee, Legislative Committee, Homeless Task Force and the Transportation Committee.

She is very active in the local community through her service to various civic organiza-

tions. She currently serves on the board of the Salvation Army, Farish Street YMCA, School of Liberal Arts for Jackson State University and the Mississippi Sports Hall of Fame.

She serves as the Advisory Council Member and Chair of the National League of Cities, National President of Women in Municipal Government and State President of Women in Municipal Government. She is involved in the Urban Poverty Task Force; the National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families; and the Mississippi Municipal Association.

She and her husband, Dr. Al Simon, have five daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Councilwoman Margaret C. Barrett-Simon for her dedication to serving others for 32 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to vote on the afternoon of Thursday, January 10, 2018 as my mother passed away.

I oppose S. 140, which contained the language of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. I strongly respect the sovereign rights of Native American Tribes. This bill, however, is nothing more than another attempt to undermine collective bargaining. In the process, it would strip hundreds of thousands of workers—the majority of whom are not tribe members—their right to a voice in the workplace.

As the UAW points out, at a time of growing wealth inequality and a shrinking middle class, the last thing Congress should do is deprive workers of their legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively when there is indisputable evidence that unions help increase worker wages.

I would have voted against this bill, which seeks to deprive workers of their right to advocate for themselves and ask for the wages they deserve.

RECOGNIZING SILGAN CLOSURES

HON. RODNEY DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Silgan Closures, a leader in the manufacturing industry in Illinois' 13th District.

The Silgan Closures plant in Champaign, Illinois was awarded the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award by the Illinois Sustainable Technology Center. Over the past year, Silgan has made significant changes to its operation in an effort to reduce energy consumption, making it a true example of the sustainability in manufacturing and a deserving recipient of this award.

By converting from injection molding machines to compression molding machines, Silgan was able to reduce the company's greenhouse gas emissions by nearly 2,900

metric tons. Silgan also began using rail to import their plastic resin, further reducing carbon dioxide emissions. Even small changes like switching to LED lightbulbs and using more environmentally friendly cleaning agents have had a significant impact when it comes to cutting down on energy use at Silgan's facility in Champaign.

As a member of the Climate Solutions Caucus, I will continue to support policies like Section 179(d) of the IRS code, which incentivizes businesses to become more energy efficient, and the Mechanical Insulation Installation Incentive Act, which would expand 179(d) to include the installation of mechanical insulation. Businesses like Silgan Closures are an example of how incentivizing sustainability can produce results. I'm proud to highlight the good work that Silgan Closures is doing to lead the way in sustainable manufacturing in my district. They are certainly deserving of the 2017 Illinois Sustainability Award.

COST ESTIMATE ON H.R. 4567, THE DHS OVERSEAS PERSONNEL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the following cost estimate for H.R. 4567, the DHS Overseas Personnel Enhancement Act of 2017, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office was not made available to the Committee at the time of filing of the legislative report.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2018.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4567, the DHS Overseas Personnel Enhancement Act of 2017.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL.

Enclosure.

H.R. 4567—DHS OVERSEAS PERSONNEL
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

As passed by the House of Representatives
on January 10, 2018

H.R. 4567 would require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to devise a plan to improve the effectiveness of DHS personnel who are stationed at foreign locations. The act also would require DHS—about twice a year over the next four years—to provide briefings to the Congress on department personnel with primary duties outside the United States. Using information from DHS, CBO estimates that implementing the act's provisions would cost less than \$500,000 annually; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Enacting H.R. 4567 would not affect direct spending or revenues; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4567 would not increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028.

H.R. 4567 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz. The estimate was approved by H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAID REIMBURSEMENT ACT OF 2018

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the District of Columbia Medicaid Reimbursement Act of 2018, the seventh time I have introduced this bill. My bill would increase the federal government's share of the District's Medicaid expenditures, known as the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP), from 70 to 80 percent. The District, a medium-sized American city, should not pay more than other large cities. For example, in 2012–2013, New York City, the jurisdiction that powers the economy of New York State, contributed 20 percent of the state's Medicaid costs, while the state paid 33 percent, less than the District's federally mandated 30 percent contribution.

When the District faced financial difficulty as the only city to pay for state functions, Congress, with the District's consent, passed the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (Revitalization Act), which transferred from the District to the federal government the costs and/or operations of several state functions, including prisons, courts and offender supervision. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which included the Revitalization Act, statutorily set D.C.'s FMAP at 70 percent. The District's financial crisis was largely the result of the District's uniqueness as the only city responsible for paying for state functions, while the federal government also imposed unique revenue limitations on the District. All of the revenue limitations remain. Congress recognized that state costs are inappropriate for a city to shoulder, though the District has continued to carry many of these burdens like a state.

Medicaid is a joint federal-state program. The FMAP statutory minimum is 50 percent and the maximum is 83 percent. Local funds may constitute up to 60 percent of a state's share. The FMAP formula is based on a state's per capita income relative to the national average, and the higher a state's per capita income, the lower the FMAP. If the District operated under the FMAP formula, as it did prior to the Revitalization Act, the federal government would pay only 50 percent of D.C.'s Medicaid expenditures.

The District, a city with no state to contribute to it, must alone absorb the state portion of Medicaid. Thus, the District pays for 30 percent of Medicaid, more than any U.S. city. Considering the difference in the size of its tax base, the District should certainly contribute no more than New York City's contribution to Medicaid. Therefore, my bill would raise the federal contribution to the District's Medicaid program to 80 percent, equal to that of New York City.

On December 21, 2017, Representative Morgan Griffith introduced a bill (H.R. 4709) that would blow a massive hole in the Dis-

trict's budget by reducing the FMAP for D.C. from the current 70 percent to 54 percent. Under the bill, beginning in fiscal year 2020, the federal government would pay the higher of the FMAP formula or a FMAP fixed percentage that decreases until it reaches 54 percent in 2027 and thereafter. This Griffith bill demonstrates a complete misunderstanding of the uniqueness of D.C.'s structure and economy and the intent of the Revitalization Act. I will fight to defeat this backwards bill.

In 1997, a formula error in the Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital allotment reduced the 70 percent FMAP share, and, as a result, the District received only \$23 million instead of the \$49 million it was due. I was able to secure a technical correction in the Balanced Budget Act of 1999, partially increasing the annual allotment to \$32 million from fiscal year 2000 forward. I appreciate that, in 2005, Congress responded to our effort to get an additional annual increase of \$20 million in the budget reconciliation bill, bringing D.C.'s Medicaid reimbursements to \$57 million, as intended by the Revitalization Act, although this amount did not reimburse the District for the years the federal error denied the city part of its rightful federal contribution.

In conclusion, this bill would treat the District just like the federal government treats other large cities when it comes to Medicaid reimbursement rates, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE ROBERT YATES

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Robert Yates upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

Getting his NASCAR start with Holman-Moody Racing, Robert was mentored by fellow NASCAR Hall of Famer Junior Johnson. In 1983, as the engine builder for Bobby Allison and Cale Yarborough, he was able to lead Bobby to a series championship with DiGardi Racing. His accomplishments allowed him to launch his own team in the late 1980s, Robert Yates Racing. Success followed him during every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR history.

By the time he retired, Robert Yates had amassed 57 total wins, 1,155 starts and 48 poles won. His accomplishments also include winning the NASCAR premier series championship and the Daytona 500 three times. To say Robert Yates is a racing legend would be a gross understatement. A fierce competitor and true gentleman, he is the embodiment of racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Robert Yates is extremely deserving of this honor and will now be en-

shrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Robert Yates on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

HONORING JAMES CODY BURKHAM

HON. BRUCE WESTERMAN

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true patriot and friend. James Cody Burkhams of Hope, Arkansas, has faithfully served in my office as a legislative correspondent and most recently as a legislative assistant. He previously served on my congressional campaign, for a combination of four years on my staff.

Whether it was traveling the farms of the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas to meet with cattle ranchers or taking a meeting with postal workers, Cody put in the long hours to meet the needs of his fellow Arkansans.

When I learned Cody would take a new position that would return him to our beloved Natural State, I felt sadness for the people of the Fourth District to lose Cody's hard work and persistence. At the same time, I felt happiness and joy for him as he begins the next chapter of his life. I give Cody thanks for his dedication during these four years and wish him the best.

HONORING THE 2018 ACADEMY NOMINEES OF THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, more high school seniors from the 11th Congressional District trade in varsity jackets for Navy pea coats, Air Force flight suits, and Army brass buckles than most other districts in the country. In fact, this is nothing new—our area has repeatedly sent an above average portion of its sons and daughters to the nation's military academies for decades.

This fact should not come as a surprise. The educational excellence of area schools is well known and has long been a magnet for families looking for the best environment in which to raise their children. Our graduates are skilled not only in mathematics, science, and social studies, but also have solid backgrounds in sports, debate, and other extracurricular activities. This diverse upbringing makes military academy recruiters sit up and take note—indeed, many recruiters know our towns and schools by name.

Since the 1830s, Members of Congress have enjoyed meeting, talking with, and nominating superb young people to our military academies. But how did this process evolve? In 1843, when West Point was the sole academy, Congress ratified the nominating process and became directly involved in the composition of our military's leadership. This was not

an act of an imperial Congress bent on controlling every aspect of government. Rather, the procedure still used today was, and is, a further check and balance in our democracy. It was originally designed to weaken and divide political coloration in the officer corps, provide geographical balance to our armed services, and to make the officer corps more resilient to unfettered nepotism and hand-capped European armies.

In 1854, Representative Gerritt Smith of New York added a new component to the academy nomination process, the academy review board. This was the first time a Member of Congress appointed prominent citizens from his district to screen applicants and assist with the serious duty of nominating candidates for academy admission. Today, I am honored to continue this wise tradition in my service to the 11th Congressional District.

My Academy Review Board is composed of local citizens who have shown exemplary service to New Jersey, to their communities, and to the continued excellence of education in our area; many are veterans. Although from diverse backgrounds and professions, they all share a common vision, that the best qualified and motivated graduates attend our academies. And, as true for most volunteer panels, their service goes largely unnoticed.

I would like to take a moment to recognize and thank them publicly for participating in this important panel. Being on the board requires hard work and an objective mind. Members have the responsibility of interviewing upwards of 50 outstanding young men and women every year in the academy review process.

The nomination process follows a general timetable. High school seniors mail personal information directly to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy once they become interested in attending. Information includes academic achievement, college entry test scores, and other activities. At this time, they also inform my office of their desire to be nominated.

The academies then assess the applicants, rank them based on the data supplied, and return the files to my office with their notations. In late November, our Academy Review Board interviews all of the applicants over the course of two days. They assess a student's qualifications and analyze character, desire to serve, and other talents that may not appear on paper.

This year the board interviewed over 40 applicants. The Board's recommendations were then forwarded to the academies, where recruiters reviewed files and notified applicants and my office of their final decision on admission.

As these highly motivated and talented young men and women go through the academy nominating process, never let us forget the sacrifice they are preparing to make: to defend our country and protect our citizens. This holds especially true at a time when our nation is fighting the war against terrorism. Whether it is in the Middle East, Africa or other troubled spots around the world, we are constantly reminded that wars are fought by the young. And, while our military missions are both important and dangerous, it is reassuring to know that we continue to put America's best and brightest in command.

ACADEMY NOMINEES FOR 2018, 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Annie Guo, Livingston, Livingston High School; Hayley Zwickel, Pine Brook, Montville Township High School; Griffin Heyrich, Madison, Madison High School; Sarah Houser, Morristown, Morristown High School; Apurva Memani, Livingston, Pingry School; Rushi Desai, Parsippany, Morris Hills High School; Tyler Kim, Montville, Montville Township High School.

MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Anthony Corso, Fairfield, Maritime College, State University of New York; Alexander Schlegel, Mendham, West Morris Mendham High School; Thomas Rodgers, Caldwell, James Caldwell High School.

NAVAL ACADEMY

Juliana Valencia, Pompton Lakes, Pompton Lakes High School; Andre Papasavas, Woodland Park, Passaic Valley High School; Grace Perrotta, Bloomfield, Bloomfield High School; Peter Yamasaki, Pequannock, Trinity Christian School; Morgan La Sala, Wayne, Wayne Valley High School; Brendan Flood, Denville, Seton Hall Preparatory School; Calvin Poche, Morristown, Morristown-Beard School; Joseph Rosowicz, Chatham, Regis High School; Daniel DuBois, Wayne, Don Bosco Preparatory School; Andrew Lee, East Hanover, Oratory Preparatory.

MILITARY ACADEMY

Ajay Hariharan, Randolph, Randolph High School; Charles Marashlian, North Caldwell, Seton Hall Preparatory School; Timothy Cieslak, Wayne, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Alyssa Chellaraj, Morris Plains, Parsippany Christian School; Jeffrey Sun, Mendham, Morris Hills High School; Timothy Higgins, Morris Plains, Chatham High School; Spencer Cowen, North Caldwell, West Essex Regional High School; Patrick MacLean, Mendham, West Morris Mendham High School; Matthew Rothman, Pequannock, Pequannock High School; Aaron Tam, Pompton Lakes, Rutgers University.

PROMOTING THE 2018 MARCH FOR LIFE

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise to recognize the March for Life on Friday, January 19, 2018, here in Washington, D.C. This is a gathering of thousands of Americans from across our great country, all who are standing up for the protection of unborn children.

Ever since the reprehensible ruling by the Supreme Court in *Roe vs. Wade*, the barbaric practice of abortion on demand has been rampant in our country. All too often we fall into the trap of conflating women's health with abortion, assuming that if one supports protecting life, then we're failing to care for women's health. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I stand here today with the millions of Americans across our country who believe that the lives of innocent children must be protected. I have long been a staunch advocate for pro-life

issues despite vocal opposition. As Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, I shepherded the partial-birth abortion ban through Congress. It was one of my greatest honors to watch President George W. Bush sign it into law, and I was relieved that the Supreme Court upheld it. I have fully supported every effort in Congress to stop federally funded abortions, both in the United States and abroad, and will continue to fight efforts to federally fund these horrific practices.

CELEBRATING JOYCE NEWTON

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Joyce Newton. When Joyce passed away on Tuesday, January 16, our nation lost a devoted leader who loved her country, and I lost a good friend.

Joyce and her husband Bob, who passed away in 2012, lived a meaningful life full of love, laughter, and happiness. In 1957, the Newtons started Hoosier Racing Tire. With his determination and her steady guidance, the Newtons transformed their small family business into the world's largest producer of race tires.

Joyce and Bob Newton put their heart and soul into everything they did, and 61 years after they started their business, our community is so much stronger thanks to their generosity. As Hoosier Racing Tire grew, they began giving back to ensure their own children and Hoosiers across our community would have every opportunity to succeed. As a symbol of her inspiring hard work and determination, our community expressed its gratitude for Joyce by selecting her to represent Lakeville as a torchbearer in Indiana's Bicentennial Torch Relay.

Joyce's four kids, 12 grandkids, and 13 great-grandkids—and counting—will always remember the kind, loving person she was. They will also fondly remember their countless family vacations, trips to country music concerts, and the various community events in which Joyce was intimately involved. This family's close bond was held together by Joyce's giving heart and contagious smile.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the life Joyce Newton led and for her service to the northern Indiana community. Her passion for helping others strengthened Lakeville and all surrounding areas and improved the lives of everyone she knew. I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating her life and recognizing her outstanding public service.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE RAY EVERNHAM

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate racing legend Ray Evernham upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

Success followed Ray Evernham during every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR history. In 1992, Crew Chief Ray Evernham and a young Jeff Gordon teamed up and would eventually re-write the record books for nearly a decade.

Upon his retirement, Ray Evernham had amassed 46 total wins, 213 starts and 30 pole positions across NASCAR's three national series. His accomplishments also include victories at two Daytona 500s and two Brickyard 400s, along with leading the Number 24 team to three championships in four seasons. A true competitor and a pillar of motorsports for decades, Mr. Evernham will now take his rightful place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Mr. Evernham is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Ray Evernham on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN RECOGNITION OF JERRY MYERS AND HIS SERVICE TO DAVIE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

HON. TED BUDD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jerry Myers and congratulate him on his retirement.

Since 1988, Jerry Myers has been a tireless servant of the people and impacted countless individuals throughout his community. He proudly worked for the Davie County Emergency Medical Services and has overseen countless safety initiatives and plans. Jerry has accomplished much in his career from securing grant funding from the Department of Homeland Security, successfully leading fire safety improvement efforts, and training countless individuals to impact their community in a positive way.

When Hurricane Matthew devastated hundreds of thousands of North Carolinians in October 2016, Jerry responded without hesitation. Along with a few other men from Davie county, he traveled to Raleigh to rescue citizens from rising waters. He led one of the first rescue teams in the Raleigh area, rescuing people from trees, homes, and the rising water levels. His actions saved countless lives during Hurricane Matthew and helped local emergency response teams.

Residing in Davie County, he has two children and has shown himself to be a consummate family man. Jerry is a proud member of Bear Creek Baptist Church and remains an active member in the community. I am extremely grateful for Jerry's contributions and service and I wish him continued success. As you can tell, it will be hard to replace Jerry Myers, a gentleman that has always striven to help others first.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring Jerry Myers for his service to Davie County and wish him well in his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DeSAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to vote on Friday, January 11, 2018 as my mother passed away.

We can provide law enforcement officials with the resources and capabilities necessary to defend the nation while simultaneously upholding the hard-fought and hard-won individual rights enshrined in the Constitution. As we now know, the National Security Agency has collected vast swaths of telephone and internet data, using Section 702 as justification, some of which was on Americans for whom there was no suspicion of wrongdoing. Liberty and security do not need to be mutually exclusive. However, S. 139 did not do enough to protect Americans from the watchful eye of government surveillance.

I strongly supported the amendment put forth by Congressman JUSTIN AMASH and Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN that would put more limitations on access to information collected on Americans and stronger safeguards against law enforcement using that information without a warrant. I would have supported this amendment and was disappointed that it did not pass.

Without the addition of the Amash-Lofgren amendment, I would have voted against this bill. There is still space to address these issues so that individual privacy rights will be upheld while our country is protected, but this bill did not protect Americans' privacy adequately.

TRIBUTE TO XAVIER STAUBS

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, rise today to pay tribute to Xavier Staubs, a freshman at Corunna High School, for his heroic actions in saving a rival swimmer from drowning during a swim meet. Xavier showed bravery and courage in helping to save the life of another.

Xavier is a freshman at Corunna High School and on Thursday, January 4, his quick and decisive action saved the life of a competing student. After completing the last leg of the 200-yard medley relay against rival Owosso High School he noticed panicked spectators pointing to Kamrin Samson, a junior at Owosso High School, who was sinking to the bottom of the pool. Xavier jumped back into the pool, swam down, and brought Kamrin back to the surface to receive the medical attention he needed. Once Kamrin was out of the water, medical personnel and coaching staff from both high schools performed the necessary treatment to resuscitate him.

For such a young individual, Xavier did not waver in a crucial moment. He was fearless and courageous at a time of life or death for

a fellow swimmer. To Xavier, all that mattered was doing the right thing. Actions such as these should serve as a guideline for how we should live our own lives: selflessness in service to others. Xavier's heroic actions on January 4 will be remembered by those in attendance for years to come, and they are a defining moment in his young life.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Xavier Staubs for his heroic and selfless actions.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF MARY AUDREY GALLAGHER

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and service of Mary Audrey Gallagher. An educator, advocate, and proud mother, Audrey passed away peacefully on January 4, 2018, after enjoying time with her loved ones during the holidays. Audrey's life truly embodied the spirit of a hard-working, loving Irish American, as she nurtured strong bonds in her communities while fighting for the rights of the disenfranchised. Born on September 6, 1932, Audrey's honesty and integrity were formally recognized when she graduated from The Mary Louis Academy in Queens, New York, with the Character, Loyalty, and Spirit of Study Award, one of the academy's highest honors.

Upon graduating high school, Audrey attended and graduated from St. John's University, where she was captain of the school's Cheerleading Squad. After leaving a lasting mark on her campus community as a promising prospective instructor, she became a public school teacher. Some years later, Audrey married Warren Dromm. Her son, my dear friend and now-New York City Council Member Daniel Dromm, was born soon after. She was also mother to Lori, Marybeth, John, and Joseph. Her exemplary record of service continued, and after opening a nursery school, Audrey went on to become the director of multiple day care centers in New York City. She was instrumental in unionizing workers and she helped secure much-needed pay raises for paraprofessionals. Her courage and dedication changed lives. Audrey's support of her son, an openly-gay man, greatly advanced the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community through his advocacy and by founding the Queens chapter of Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG), of which Audrey was an active participant.

Audrey, along with Daniel and PFLAG-founder Jeanne Manfred, worked to use their voices to fight the good fight against bigotry and intolerance in Queens and throughout New York City. But her support did not stop there—Audrey became a venerable presence in the Queens LGBT community, attending parades, advising the parents of LGBT youth, and wholeheartedly supporting her son in his own endeavors to improve Queens. Having served as PFLAG's Queens Hospitality Chairperson, Audrey believed in the special role that parents of LGBT children play. It is evident that her love for her son helped make

him the strong advocate he is today for the people of Jackson Heights and Elmhurst.

Mary Audrey Gallagher's energy and light is forever memorialized in the LGBT parents and children that can find support in her community today, and in children of her own. She is survived by Daniel, Marybeth, John, and Joseph. Audrey served as a remarkable example that love can, and should, triumph, and that there are few undertakings more rewarding than devotion to family and civic service. A Queens heroine, equal-rights crusader, and loving Irish-American mom, Audrey will be missed. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mary Audrey Gallagher. May she rest in peace.

HONORING IRWIN STOVROFF

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a great Floridian, Irwin Stovroff, who passed away peacefully this week at the age of 95.

Born in Buffalo, N.Y., Irwin served in World War II as the 2nd Lieutenant in the 506th Squadron, 44th Bomb Group. He was captured by the Germans as a Jewish prisoner of war at Stalag Luft 1 and later received the Purple Heart for his courageous service.

Mr. Stovroff's dedication to veterans was the focus of his life. He founded Vets Helping Heroes, a nonprofit group to help veterans in need of service dogs, and it is through his efforts that the NDAA of 2010 included language from the Wounded Warrior K-9 Corps Act. Mr. Stovroff also volunteered as a National Service Officer for ex-POWs at the Palm Beach VA hospital. His selfless service to others embodied the commitment to national service that distinguishes the Greatest Generation.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly honored to have known Irwin. He and his dog Cash were frequent and welcome visitors to my office, when Irwin and I would discuss ways our community could better serve our veterans.

Mr. Stovroff was an American hero. I extend my heartfelt condolences to Doris, the rest of Irwin's family, his many dear friends, and all those who were touched by his kindness, compassion and dedication to our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Stovroff's life and the lives of all veterans. Our nation is better because of Mr. Stovroff's service.

COMMEMORATING THE 2018 MARCH FOR LIFE

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I recognize the thousands of faithful and devoted students descending on Washington, D.C. to attend the March for Life Rally. The March for Life began in Washington, D.C., as a small demonstration and rapidly grew to be the largest pro-life event in the world.

I am proud to represent Peoria Notre Dame High School and Bloomington Central Catholic

High School, both participating in today's march. I applaud the institutions across the country that send their students to this event heightening their devotion to the cause.

These students show true dedication to their beliefs by taking the time out of their busy lives to travel across the country to show their support for the pro-life movement. I feel it is critical in this day in age for young, faithful people to get involved and fight for the sanctity of human life. The dedication and energy these student have shown are vital to the continued advocacy of pro-life issues.

This event, and the students and organizers who make it possible, deserve to be recognized today as pillars of society and strong examples of civic leadership.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE KEN SQUIER

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the broadcasting legend Ken Squier upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

"Welcome to the Great American Race", Ken would say as viewers tuned in to watch the race. As one of NASCAR's original broadcasters, Ken was able to make the audience feel not only that they were at the race but that it was the most exciting race they had ever watched. Success followed him during every step of his journey, which culminated in one of the most impressive broadcasting careers in NASCAR history.

Throughout his career, Ken saw the importance of broadcasting and his understanding of the future of the sport led him to become a co-founder of the Motor Racing Network. "Common men doing uncommon things", Ken would describe drivers as his voice filled houses with excitement all across the country. His reverberations on the sport can still be felt today. To say Ken Squier is a NASCAR broadcasting legend would be a gross understatement. Ken is the embodiment of racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. Ken was one of five chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Ken Squier is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Ken Squier on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

HONORING REVEREND HENRY ANDERSON, SR.

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr.

Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr., is a native of Holmes County; Lexington, Mississippi, and the third son of ten children born to the late Mr. James Anderson, Sr., and Mrs. Martha Friar Anderson who resides in Lexington, Mississippi. He is married to the former Dorothy Mae Harmon Anderson, and is a faithful and dedicated member of Rockport Missionary Baptist Church where he serves as Assistant Pastor. Reverend Anderson and his wife are the proud parents of three children: Anthony, Kimberly and Henry, Jr., and the grandparents of seven grandchildren.

Upon graduating from Lexington Attendance Center, presently Holmes County Central High School, Reverend Anderson became employed with J.J. Ferguson Asphalt Company, where he worked successfully for thirty-eight years; working his way up to an Asphalt Superintendent Manager. In this leadership position, he learned how to supervise workers in order to maintain quality production by being consistent, bidding for jobs, organizing materials to set up jobs, and maximizing production to ensure profits through sound financial management and effective communication.

After retiring from J.J. Ferguson Asphalt Company, and spending over forty-one years contributing to public service, Reverend Anderson saw the need for more Black owned businesses in Holmes County to support the communities at hand. After deep concentration and researching Black owned businesses in the county, Reverend Anderson saw the need for a Black owned Farm Supply Company due to the steep prices imposed on farm supplies already in the county and surrounding areas. With the desire and know how, and a long history and heritage rooted in farming, Reverend Anderson had the stamina to initiate the business, Anderson's Farm Supply, in March of 2010 and became an Entrepreneur of the business in April of 2010 which lends itself to a variety of farming needs. As a qualified and concerned citizen of Holmes County, Reverend Anderson was elected in November of 2015 by the people to serve as Supervisor for Beat 1, where he gives total commitment to the county and communities as a whole.

Reverend Anderson is a person who believes in involving all business and stakeholders in Holmes County, pushing for economic development, cooperative partnership and total community involvement in the business world. He listens and acts on important issues that involve all citizens in Holmes County, Lexington, Mississippi. He believes in working together in order to build on the accomplishments of the county that already exists, and moving forward to accomplish even more business for the betterment of his county and communities as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Reverend Henry Anderson, Sr. for his dedication to the community, friends and his family.

VETERANS VIEWS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere gratitude that I take this time to recognize

the Veterans Views radio program, broadcasting out of Hammond, Indiana. For nearly a decade, the program's hosts, past and present, have been tireless advocates for veterans residing in Indiana's First Congressional District, across the nation, and abroad. As Veterans Views approaches its 10th anniversary, I commend those involved for not only bringing veterans' issues to the forefront, but for giving those who served a voice.

From its humble beginnings on a cable access channel, before shifting to its current radio format, several local veterans who once made personal sacrifices to defend our country assembled to serve their veteran brothers and sisters in another way. Selflessly, these individuals provided an avenue by which veterans could share their collective experiences, and in doing so, forged a path of public service that has improved the lives of many veterans. Local veterans Ernie Dillon, Bill Emerson, Patrick O'Donnell, Dennis Shults, and Donald Shults combined their experiences and knowledge to create a platform where veterans in the community might seek support or assistance or discuss pertinent issues.

Currently, Veterans Views, hosted by Ernie Dillon, Patrick O'Donnell, Bill Emerson, and David Hinshaw, airs weekly on WJOB 1230 AM and also shares its message via livestream, allowing veterans throughout the country and around the world to participate. The focus of the show remains to help fellow veterans understand issues ranging from benefits and health care to finances and employment. The dedicated hosts are keenly aware of developments within the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense, while keeping up-to-date on matters that may potentially affect their audience.

Veterans Views is to be commended for its efforts to safeguard the well-being of those to whom we are indebted for the courage and sacrifice exhibited during their service. In recognition of these efforts, the program has received numerous accolades over the years, including the Excellence in Communication award, presented by the American Legion Department of Indiana in 2011, in addition to being honored by the Indiana General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing Veterans Views and thanking all of those associated with this integral program for their service on behalf of veterans everywhere, and in particular, to those living within Indiana's First Congressional District. For their unwavering dedication to the brave men and women who have defended our nation, the hosts, producers, and sponsors of Veterans Views are worthy of the highest commendation.

HONORING ED SCHULZE

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ed Schulze of Novato, California, for his exceptional commitment to public service and civic engagement. For nearly 45 years, Mr. Schulze has dedicated himself to effecting positive change in his community, serving in numerous leadership positions and volunteering countless hours.

Novato commemorates their city's founding with a celebration that, among other things, honors one resident as the city's Citizen of the Year. This honoree is nominated by members of the community, and is selected by a citizen committee who look for individuals that have made significant contributions to the City of Novato. Ed Schulze has been selected this year, on the 58th anniversary of the city's founding, in recognition of nearly a half-century of civic engagement on behalf of his community.

Ed Schulze moved to Novato with his wife Marilyn in 1973. First getting involved with his homeowner's association, Mr. Schulze would end up working on a wide array of local issues surrounding public safety, the environment, education, and the integrity of the city's leadership pipeline.

Never seeking public office himself, Mr. Schulze would instead serve on numerous boards and commissions including the county's Parole Board, Major Crimes Task Force Oversight Committee, Operational Area Disaster and Citizen Corps Council, and the Marin County Grand Jury. Through these roles, Mr. Schulze was able to improve the public's relationship with local government agencies and fight for issues such as pesticide reduction in western Marin County.

Ed Schulze's impact on the City of Novato can be measured not only through the issues he has worked on, or meetings he has attended, but also through the people whose lives he has touched over the years. As a dedicated family man and consummate public advocate, he has inspired generations of community leaders since moving to Novato nearly a half-century ago.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Ed Schulze for his many years of selfless volunteerism and leadership across the City of Novato and the County of Marin.

CONGRATULATING MR. A. ROBERT TINDALL

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mr. A. Robert Tindall on his 91st birthday that was celebrated on January 5, 2018.

A. Robert Tindall, or known by his friends as Bob, was born in Trenton on January 5, 1927. Bob is one of a few remaining American veterans who has served our country during World War II.

Bob served as a Radioman in the United States Navy, where he was stationed on a minesweeper. During the war, Bob served his country by helping to detect underwater mines that could have done great harm to our fleets. Because of his invaluable service, Bob's work helped countless ships from being destroyed and in time saved thousands of lives.

After leaving the Navy, Bob attended Rider College in New Jersey and then Drexel University in Philadelphia where he studied mechanical engineering. While attending college, Bob's father owned a real estate business and asked Bob to assist. His work with his dad in real estate eventually led him to start his own career in real estate and insurance. Today,

Bob resides in Ewing. He has three children, four grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating Bob on his birthday, and to thank him for his service to this country. Let us never forget the sacrifice he and others like him made to protect the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF MARY HELEN MCCAY, PH.D.

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Dr. Mary Helen McCay who has just been named a Fellow of the National Academy of Inventors—a highly prestigious professional distinction. Dr. McCay currently serves as University Research Professor and Director of Florida Institute of Technology's National Center for Hydrogen Research. She was inducted into the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame in 2017.

Dr. McCay grew up in Fort Pierce just south of Florida's Space Coast. A fan of space exploration from an early age, Mary Helen remembers watching Astronaut John Glenn's famous launch during high school assembly. Like many young people growing up on the Space Coast at that time—including myself—her enthusiasm for our space program grew as she regularly visited Patrick Air Force Base and Kennedy Space Center to watch our rocket launches. With a strong interest in studying science and engineering, she went on to earn her Ph.D. in Metallurgical Engineering from the University of Florida in 1973.

Dr. McCay was a Principal Investigator at NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center for almost 20 years where she studied the influence of microgravity of single crystal formation and conducted failure analyses of space vehicle materials. She was Principal Investigator on a Microgravity Laboratory I flight experiment, as well as three other flight experiments and received the NASA Scientific Achievement Medal for her work. Her involvement with NASA led to her becoming a Payload Specialist Astronaut for Space Shuttle Challenger Flight Spacelab-3 mission.

Prior to joining the Florida Institute of Technology, Dr. McCay was Professor of Engineering Science and Mechanics, Chair of the Center for Laser Applications, and Adjunct Professor of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science at the University of Tennessee Space Institute and received numerous awards for her groundbreaking research. She has published more than 130 technical articles; serves as reviewer on 8 peer-reviewed journals; and holds 24 patents, 22 for laser-induced-surface improvement and its applications. Together with her husband, Dr. Dwayne McCay, the President of the Florida Institute of Technology, she holds 15 joint U.S. patents in the area of metallurgical engineering.

When asked about her inspiration in science, Dr. McCay points to Madame Curie for her persistence as well as her brilliance. She credits her mother and father as key influences in her life, as well as the Dominican sisters who taught her in grade school, her high

school chemistry teacher, Mr. Harris, Dean Rogers at Florida State University, and her husband.

A strong advocate for STEM education, Dr. McCay has worked to establish STEM mentoring groups between faculty and new students attending the Florida Institute of Technology. Along with her colleagues she does outreach to local high schools to encourage students to consider pursuing a career in one of the STEM fields. She also coordinates a K-12 Girls in Science Summer Camp the Florida Institute of Technology.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dr. Mary Helen McCay, as well as Dr. Dwayne McCay and the dedicated faculty of the Florida Institute of Technology, for their contributions to science and engineering, and for their commitment to inspiring young minds and future scientists of our nation.

U.S.-KAZAKHSTAN RELATIONS

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to the United States, and to recognize the strong and growing relationship between our two countries.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Kazakhstan became an independent nation, and the United States was the first country to recognize it. Since then, over the last 26 years, Kazakhstan and the United States have built a strategic partnership based on mutual trust, commitment, and genuine friendship in order to advance our bilateral political, military and economic goals.

Over the years, a major pillar of our strategic partnership has been built on a shared interest in nuclear non-proliferation and security. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan inherited the fourth largest nuclear stockpile in the world—roughly 1,410 nuclear warheads. Through President Nazarbayev's leadership, and in conjunction with the United States, Kazakhstan renounced its arsenal, became a non-nuclear state, and continues to be a leader in nuclear security.

Further, the economic ties between our two countries continue to expand, particularly in areas such as energy and investment. This is evident through our work to implement WTO obligations and improve the investment climate. In 2016, bilateral trade with Kazakhstan grew to \$1.9 billion (a 117 percent increase from 2015), supporting more than 7,000 U.S. jobs. Just last year, the USA Pavilion at Kazakhstan's International Expo showcased the successful collaboration between our two countries and paved the way for future joint projects and partnerships.

Lastly, as the Chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee, I am proud of the close partnership our two nations have forged on efforts to promote peace and stability around the world. I am particularly appreciative of the role Kazakhstan has played in support of United States counter-terrorism efforts following the unforgettable attack on our homeland on September 11, 2001. President Nazarbayev's dedication to working with the United States to defeat terrorism and extre-

mism around the world is sincerely appreciated, and critical to our success.

As a testament to our long history of friendship and advancement of mutual priorities, I look forward to increasing the collaboration between our two countries in the years to come. Kazakhstan remains one of our most reliable and trusted partners throughout the world, and I am eager to watch our relationship grow in the future.

HONORING SHERIFF K.C. HAMP

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an extraordinary community leader, Sheriff K.C. Hamp of Tunica County, Mississippi.

Tunica County Sheriff Calvin "K.C." Hamp, known since childhood with the reversed initials K.C., is a native of Tunica County, Mississippi. K.C. is an active member of Union Street Church of Christ, where his brother, Sylvester Thomas Jr., is Pastor. He is married to Patonya Price-Hamp and has four children, two daughters, two sons and one grandson.

Sheriff Hamp was elected to his fourth term as Sheriff in November of 2015. Sheriff Hamp is a graduate of Rosa Fort High School and holds an Associates of Arts degree from Coahoma Community College. He attended the University of Mississippi to obtain his Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice; moreover his training and education is ongoing.

K.C. began working with the Tunica County Sheriffs Office in 1994 and started his career in law enforcement as a Deputy Jailer. During his 20 year tenure with the Tunica County Sheriffs Office his assignments have included Patrol Supervisor, Auto Theft Investigator, D.A.R.E. Officer and Internal Affairs Investigator.

Sheriff Hamp is an organizer of the Tunica County T.R.I.A.D. and is a member of the National Sheriffs' Association, Mississippi Sheriffs' Association, MS D.A.R.E. Association, Tunica County Literacy Council and Tunica County 10-Point Coalition.

Sheriff Hamp was appointed by Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour to the following state boards: Mississippi Crime Stoppers, Advisory Council, Byrne-JAG Drug Task Force Committee and Mississippi Trauma Advisory Committee, in which his appointment with the Mississippi Trauma Advisory Committee has continued under Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant. He also serves on the D.U.I. Advisory Task Force Committee, Mississippi Department of Corrections Oversight Task Force, Asset Forfeiture Task Force and Mississippi Child Death Review Panel.

K.C. is elected to serve as President of the Mississippi Sheriffs' Association beginning June of 2016. He has served as Vice President, 2nd Vice President and 3rd Vice President.

K.C. has been a volunteer funeral director with Henderson Funeral Home in Tunica, Desoto and Panola Counties for over 25 years. He feels this is an opportunity to serve and interact with people in a time when they need a friend the most.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Sheriff K.C. Hamp for his dedication in being a respected community leader.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK DeSAULNIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to vote on the afternoon of Thursday, January 10, 2018 and Friday, January 11, 2018 as my mother passed away. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Roll Call Vote No. 8, I would have voted No; Roll Call Vote No. 9, I would have voted No; Roll Call Vote No. 10, I would have voted No; Roll Call Vote No. 11, I would have voted No; Roll Call Vote No. 12, I would have voted Yes; Roll Call Vote No. 13, I would have voted Yes; Roll Call Vote No. 14, I would have voted Yes; Roll Call Vote No. 15, I would have voted Yes; Roll Call Vote No. 16, I would have voted No; and Roll Call Vote No. 17, I would have voted Yes.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE RON HORNADAY JR.

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the racing legend Ron Hornaday Jr. upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

Ever since his early days it was clear that Ron Hornaday Jr. was born to race. A second generation racer, he was destined for high speed. Success followed him through every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR Truck Series history.

Upon his retirement, Ron Hornaday Jr. had amassed 51 total wins, 360 starts and 27 pole positions. His accomplishments also include holding 158 top fives and 234 top 10s in the Truck Series, both all-time marks. Additionally, Ron Hornaday Jr. won five straight Truck Series races, which has only been achieved three other times in NASCAR national series history. With the heart of a true champion, Ron Hornaday Jr. is the embodiment of racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Ron Hornaday Jr. is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Ron Hornaday Jr. on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

IN HONOR OF JAMES AND DIANE
LUDDECKE ON THEIR RETIRE-
MENT

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank two outstanding civil servants, James and Diane Luddecke, at the time of their joint retirement, for their many years of service to the people of my hometown, Vernon, CT. The couple has been employed in the town Finance Department for over 30 years; James as the finance director and Diane as a budget analyst.

Their diligent work managing the town's finances during often challenging times is a model of professional and nonpartisan civil service that has always been focused on the public good. Jim's leadership extended beyond the town with his active participation in the statewide Finance Officer Association, providing good counsel to his colleagues from other municipalities and to the General Assembly about ways to efficiently modernize finance systems.

During their long service, the finance office was transformed from manual, hard copy bookkeeping to a digitized, data analytical system that might have overwhelmed many of us. Instead they both embraced change and made sure that Vernon taxpayers and public officials had the benefit of 21st century technology, providing efficiency and savings.

In addition to being the Finance Director, Jim wore many other hats in his tenure with the town government. He was first appointed to the town's Fine Arts Commission and has been a part of the Computer Authority Study, the Data Processing Advisory Board, and the Study Committee for School Renovations Bond Referendum over the years. In 1989, James was appointed town treasurer. Eventually he became the liaison to the Capital Improvement Committee.

Diane, who was hired in 1985 during the Herbst administration, has been the lead in her office managing most projects and overseeing day to day operations. She has served under 11 mayors, and her smart, cheerful competence was instrumental in carrying out the mission of the Finance Department.

On a personal note, I have been friends with both Jim and Diane for many years, having been the law partner of Jim's uncle, Leo Flaherty, for 20 years. I have always admired their lively intellect, great sense of humor, mutual support for U Conn basketball—men and women, the Boston Celtics, and deep passion for the town of Vernon's unique, diverse community and amazing history.

Jim and Diane deserve all the accolades they will receive in the coming days as they end this chapter in their lives. I fully expect however, that after recharging their batteries they will find other ways to contribute to the community they love, and we will be better off for it. I ask my colleagues to please join me in thanking James and Diane for being model citizens.

HONORING HENRY CAMPBELL

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a talented and driven man Mr. Henry Campbell. Mr. Campbell has shown what can be done through tenacity, dedication and a desire to serve his community.

Henry Campbell a lifelong resident of Yazoo City, MS was born on November 26, 1957 to Margaret Campbell and Henry Coleman, the youngest of eight children.

Henry Campbell graduated from Yazoo City High School in 1975 as a student and successful athlete. His athletic talents in baseball landed him an opportunity to be drafted by the New York Yankees, but he chose to attend college instead. Campbell earned a baseball scholarship to Jackson State University where he played from 1976 through 1978, while he studied in Physical Education.

After college, Campbell enlisted in the U.S. Army Reserve for six years as a Supply Specialist at the National Guard Armory in Yazoo City, MS. Campbell started working for Yazoo City when he took a job as a maintenance person for Yazoo Housing Authority. He was later accepted a job as Manager for the Wardell Leach Recreational Complex which he managed from 1999 through 2009. In 2009 he became the Director of Parks and Recreation. After 20 years with Yazoo City he has decided to retire and spend his time hunting, fishing and traveling.

Campbell is married to Joyce Williams and to that union they have five children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Henry Campbell for his desire to make a difference in the lives of children and the community.

RECOGNIZING THE ROTARY CLUB OF BOCA RATON'S OPAL AWARDS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the important work done by the Rotary Club of Boca Raton and to congratulate the recipients of their Outstanding People and Leaders (OPAL) awards. This year's honorees are Billi and Bernie Marcus, Jerry and Joan Glassman, Frank and Laura Frione, Summer Faerman, and Reverend Bill Mitchell.

Each of these honorees have made a lasting impact on our South Florida community. Their philanthropy, service, and selfless sacrifices have touched countless lives.

I extend my most sincere congratulations to all of tonight's honorees. Looking ahead in this new year, I am confident that the Rotary Club of Boca Raton will continue to be a cherished institution in South Florida that betters our community. I greatly appreciate the Club's work and am pleased to honor their OPAL award honorees.

IN RECOGNITION OF AMANDA EDMONDS FOR HER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO THE YPSILANTI COMMUNITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Amanda Edmonds for her service to our southeastern Michigan community and Growing Hope, an Ypsilanti based non-profit, over the past 15 years. She has enriched countless lives as a local leader and Executive Director of Growing Hope.

Raised in Missouri, Ms. Edmonds has been a passionate community leader and social justice advocate since she was a young student. After receiving her B.S. and M.S. from the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources and Environment, Ms. Edmonds became involved as a volunteer in Ypsilanti in 1999. She started volunteering at Perry Learning Garden, now Growing Hope, in Ypsilanti and is looked to as a leader in sustainable gardening, economic development and local food access. Through her passion for food sustainability, she worked to expand the Perry Learning Garden into Growing Hope, a non-profit that serves southeastern Michigan communities with start-up and gardening assistance, teaching classes, and hosting local farmer's markets.

Ms. Edmonds is a beloved leader in our community and has served as the Mayor of Ypsilanti since 2014. As Growing Hope's Executive Director, Ms. Edmonds has greatly expanded the facility's urban farm and instituted teaching programs for students and adults all throughout Michigan. The program serves as an example for other sustainable urban farms, and Ms. Edmonds travels to share how Growing Hope's success can be mirrored in other communities throughout the country. Her work as Growing Hope's Executive Director has seen her appointed to the Michigan Food Policy Council, where she chaired the Healthy Food Access Task Force for the state, as well as Vice Chair of the Washtenaw Food Policy Council and Ypsilanti Parks & Recreation Committee. Ms. Edmonds has been an invaluable leader at Growing Hope, and we look forward to her continued positive impact on our Michigan community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Amanda Edmonds as she retires from her position at Growing Hope. Her work has bettered Ypsilanti's food sustainability and access for years to come.

IN HONOR OF 2018 NASCAR HALL
OF FAME INDUCTEE ROBERT
"RED" BYRON

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate the racing legend Robert Byron upon his induction into the ninth class of the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

If it weren't for men like Robert Byron, there is no doubt the racing industry as we know it

would not exist today. Robert played a pivotal role in both the development and expansion of NASCAR since its inception. After winning NASCAR's first season championship, Robert won NASCAR's first Strictly Stock title the following year, driving for car owner and Hall of Fame inductee Raymond Parks. Success followed him during every step of his journey which culminated in one of the most impressive careers in NASCAR history.

After being injured during WWII in service to his country, Robert used a modified clutch that attached to his leg. Robert continued to race and his injuries magnified his impressive skills. Even though he passed away in 1960, his legacy lives on and will now be preserved forever in the NASCAR Hall of Fame. A fierce competitor and true gentleman, he is the embodiment of racing and will now take his place among the greats in the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

This year's class was selected by a comprehensive voting panel that included track owners, retired competitors, industry leaders, members of the media, and a nationwide fan vote. In total, a group of five was chosen to join the ranks of other NASCAR legends in the Hall of Fame. Robert Byron is especially deserving of this honor and will now be enshrined forever for his contributions to the sport.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Robert Byron on his induction into the NASCAR Hall of Fame.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OXBOW PUBLIC MARKET

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Oxbow Public Market of Napa, California, which is celebrating the 10th anniversary of its opening.

Real estate developer and specialty-food consultant Steve Carlin opened the Oxbow Public Market in 2007. Home to more than two dozen specialty merchants, including a distillery, ice cream shop and bookstore, Oxbow remains one of the most popular places in Napa to find great food and wine.

Thanks to their exceptional quality and variety of products, the Oxbow Public Market has earned praise from numerous news outlets and food magazines. In September of 2017, Tasting Table, an online magazine devoted to America's best food and drink, recognized the Oxbow Market as home to "the world's best English Muffins." The magazine praised Oxbow for its numerous homemade, local offerings, and cited testimony from Oprah Winfrey, who regularly flies Oxbow's English muffins to her home and described them as "crunchy on the outside, fluffy on the inside, and scrumptious all over."

The Oxbow Public Market proudly sells sustainably-produced local crops, and supports organic farming practices, owner-operated businesses, local food producers and the agricultural community of the Napa Valley and surrounding areas. By supporting local producers and promoting sustainable practices, Oxbow not only offers area residents a reliable

source of world-class products, but provides a showcase for the innovative people and practices that make Napa's agricultural community so special.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Oxbow Public Market for creating a place in our community where people can gather to enjoy the best local produce and wind of the Napa Valley. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

HONORING JEFFERY KILPATRICK

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Mr. Jeffery Kilpatrick.

Jeffery Demond Kilpatrick was born on August 13, 1973, in East St. Louis, Illinois to the parents of Jimmy and Mary Alice Kilpatrick.

Jeffery is a dedicated member of the Body of Christ Ministry in Memphis, Tennessee under the leadership of Pastor Barbara Palmer.

Jeffery graduated high school in May 1991 from East St. Louis Senior High School. He later continued his graduate studies at Mississippi Valley State University where he earned his Bachelor and Master Degrees.

He developed an interest in politics at an early age and decided to run for the position of Mayor of the City of Drew in 2005 and was successfully re-elected in 2009 and 2013.

Along with ensuring the safety and promoting the development of new businesses and community enrichment Jeffery is a Correctional Supervisor at the Mississippi State Penitentiary and Mound Bayou Police Department where he has also made a career of protecting the citizens of Sunflower County for 23½ years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Jeffery Kilpatrick for his dedication to serving others and giving back to his community.

IRANIAN PROTESTS

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the developments in Iran. For years many in the United States and elsewhere, have been advocating for changes in Iranian policy, including the adoption and implementation of human rights with respect to dissidents, religious minorities, protesters and opponents. The recent protests, and the loss of life in response to the protests, give us the opportunity to reflect that now is the time to reaffirm freedom of expression. Now is the time to reaffirm restraint and protect the lives of protesters.

I am encouraged that the High Level Political Dialogue between the European Union and Iran in Brussels last year included a discussion on protecting and enhancing human rights. Nor should it go unnoticed that even the Iranian Supreme Leader noted that the leading opposition group, the Mujahedin-e

Khalq (MEK), has popular support within Iran. It follows that the MEK should be treated as a legitimate opposition party with grass roots appeal. The MEK has pointed out the excesses of the current government and its efforts at accountability ring true with many Iranians. It is my hope that Iran can embrace a more responsible world view, a more humane approach to its own people, and allow dissidents and protestors the freedom to air their grievances.

TRIBUTE TO NORMAN LAU KEE

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a great New Yorker, Norman Lau Kee.

Norman Lau Kee was one of the pioneers of the legal profession in New York's Chinatown. He was a grandson of Chinese immigrants, a successful academic, a World War II veteran and most significantly, was part of a very small vanguard of Asian lawyers who first provided legal representation for Chinatown residents beginning in the 1950s.

However, these accomplishments only tell part of the story of the lifelong achievements of Norman Lau Kee. He was born 90 years ago in 1927 to Sing Kee and his wife Ina Chan-Kee in New York's Chinatown. His father was a decorated veteran of World War I who was awarded the United States' Distinguished Service Cross and France's Croix de Guerre medal of honor. Norman Lau Kee attended Brooklyn Tech High School, and then served in the Navy during World War II. He later received a degree in mechanical engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). While in Boston, he met and fell in love with Esther Goon. They were married shortly thereafter and raised a family of five children who gave their parents eight grandchildren and one great grandchild. During his early professional life, Mr. Kee gravitated to law. While working fulltime with an engineering firm, he attended Fordham Law School at night from which he received his J.D. degree in 1955.

Mr. Kee was only Chinatown's third lawyer when he hung out his shingle to open his law practice in 1956. Chinatown's residents had many legal needs, and Mr. Kee developed a specialty in immigration law. He provided much-needed legal advice to families and their businesses, helping them navigate through a complex and foreign legal system. At the same time, Mr. Kee helped to bring many family members of Chinatown residents into the United States during a long period of great political and cultural upheaval in China. By bridging that gap, Mr. Kee fostered an enduring cultural connection.

Mr. Kee also played an important role in government as demonstrated by his long and impressive record of distinguished public service. Among some of his many contributions, he served on the New York City Human Rights Commission from 1969 to 1973 and was chair of the Federal Advisory Committee of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service from 1979 to 1980.

Mr. Kee left his indelible mark not only in the local arena but also in the international domain. In 1979, Norman and Esther Kee created the Washington D.C.-based U.S.-Asia Institute, chartered to improve relations between the United States and Asian nations. He led many official delegations of the Institute to Asian countries. Further, he served as its chair for many years, and then as chair emeritus. In 1980, he was a member of the Madrid conference that convened to help implement the first Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In 1980, he organized a dinner for President Jimmy Carter at the Silver Palace restaurant in Chinatown. It was the first and only time a sitting president attended a function in the neighborhood. Mr. Kee's reputation and experience in U.S.-Sino relations were esteemed and appreciated by leaders in both Washington, D.C., and China.

Despite his national and international endeavors, he never lost sight of his formative local roots and he remained active in community services. He helped found the Chinese-American Planning Council, became a board member of the highly-regarded Hamilton Madison House and helped found and served on the Board of Trustees of Confucius Plaza. Mr. Kee also served on the board of the YMCA of Greater New York. There, his efforts and financial support helped to establish the foundation of the YMCA in Chinatown, and he ensured that Chinatown was given its first swimming pool in its local Y. The YMCA ultimately conferred its highest honor on Mr. Kee, inducting him into the prestigious Order of the Red Triangle. In 2010, Mr. Kee and his son Glenn Lau-Kee were recipients of the Honorable George Bundy Smith Pioneer Award conferred by the New York State Bar Association's Federal Litigation Section. In further recognition of Mr. Kee's pioneering services as an early Chinatown lawyer that extended to a lifetime of commitment, the Asian American Bar Association of New York established the Norman Lau Kee Trailblazer Award in his honor. Norman Lau Kee closed out his professional life at the age of 89 after 60 years of practicing law and becoming a local icon who also had a national and global reputation. Norman Lau Kee touched so many lives in a positive and beneficial way. He was a paragon of the American Dream and is more than deserving of the highest praise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I missed a vote on January 17, 2018 to approve the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted to approve the previous day's Journal.

HONORING ED MORROW

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, Ed Morrow was born in Manhattan eighty years ago. His father

was a New York Times correspondent and Ed went to primary school in France and high school in Argentina. Fifty-four years ago Ed met Barbara in a political science class at Columbia University and they made a smart decision. They've now been married for fifty-four years. They had two children, Andy and Chris, in their home on Croton-on-Hudson, New York and were living a vibrant life.

They then made a decision, forty-one years ago, which indicated to many people that they had lost their minds.

Ed and Barbara sold their home, quit their jobs, and put all their eggs in one basket. They moved to Manchester, Vermont to open an independent book store.

These New Yorkers, Ed and Barbara, were welcomed in the rural community of Manchester with open arms. They worked hard, were friendly and open, and were bringing something that Vermonters really wanted, a bookstore. Ed and Barbara did the impossible. The Northshire bookstore they started in 1976, first located next to the Factory Point bank on Main Street in Manchester, has not only survived the ups and downs of bookselling and Internet retailing, but has thrived and become a center for community activity. Ed and Barbara were novices but they knew they made the right decision.

Forty-one years ago, when an apprehensive Vermonter asked whether the store they were fixing up "was going to be an adult bookstore" they were happy their focus was on children's books. Others wanted music, and Ed and Barbara provided the LPs, then the music medium.

How does a person like Ed who had no experience in the bookselling world become a master? He plunged in, along with Barbara, becoming members of the New England Book Sellers Association. Quickly, Ed became its president. They also joined the American Book Sellers Association where Ed became a board member and then president. His reputation spread. Ed was asked to travel to Eastern European countries—the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, and Russia—to teach their publishers and booksellers about the free enterprise system. After Ed and Barbara's sons completed their college education, they joined the Northshire bookstore team. Andy became knowledgeable about used books and Chris ultimately ran the business.

Over the years the Northshire bookstore has expanded from a tiny walk in shop to a renovated and beautiful building that was formerly the Colburn House. It stands dead center at the cross roads of Manchester, Vermont. Ed and Barbara's efforts were rewarded by a growing clientele, a wonderful enthusiastic staff, and an author reading program that contributed to the cultural vibrancy of the region and all of Vermont.

Ed and Barbara never stopped. As they were nearing "retirement" they responded to another unanticipated opportunity. Members of the Saratoga Springs community also wanted a bookstore, modeled after Northshire. Ed and Barbara opened what is now another thriving, independent bookstore in Saratoga Springs.

Vermonters throughout the state are celebrating the 80th birthday of Ed Morrow, a person who, with his wife, Barbara, has contributed every day to the civic life that makes small town Vermont a place of strong personal ties, civic cooperation, and intellectual ferment.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Ed Morrow, not only as a giant of Vermont,

but a leader in the United States on the value and importance of independent bookstores.

INTRODUCING THE KENNEDY-KING NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2018

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce a bill to establish a unit of the National Park System to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations the site of Senator Robert Kennedy's April 4, 1968 speech associated with the Kennedy-King Park in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Some of my colleagues might not be aware that on April 4, 1968, Robert Kennedy had scheduled a speech in Indianapolis, Indiana during his campaign for the presidency of the United States. However, just before he was to give his remarks, Mr. Kennedy was told of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. before the news became widely known publicly.

Mr. Kennedy changed his planned remarks to inform the large crowd gathered in the local park of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and called for a nonviolent response to Mr. King's death. Mr. Kennedy's speech has been described as one of the greatest addresses of the 20th Century as a call for unity and non-violence in a time of great unrest. In 1994, a memorial sculpture to honor Mr. Kennedy and Dr. King was erected on the park site.

The site of this impactful speech should be preserved as a national treasure and the 50th anniversary of the speech is a fitting time for preservation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in helping to establish the Kennedy-King National Historic site as a unit of the National Park System in Indianapolis, Indiana by supporting this act.

I include in the RECORD, the text of Mr. Kennedy's speech:

FULL TEXT OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S SPEECH:
INDIANAPOLIS, APRIL 4, 1968

"Ladies and Gentlemen,

I'm only going to talk to you just for a minute or so this evening, because I have some very sad news for all of you. Could you lower those signs, please? I have some very sad news for all of you, and, I think, sad news for all of our fellow citizens, and people who love peace all over the world; and that is that Martin Luther King was shot and was killed tonight in Memphis, Tennessee.

Martin Luther King dedicated his life to love and to justice between fellow human beings. He died in the cause of that effort. In this difficult day, in this difficult time for the United States, it's perhaps well to ask what kind of a nation we are and what direction we want to move in.

For those of you who are black considering the evidence evidently is that there were white people who were responsible you can be filled with bitterness, and with hatred, and a desire for revenge.

We can move in that direction as a country, in greater polarization black people amongst blacks, and white amongst whites, filled with hatred toward one another. Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand, and to comprehend, and replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed

that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand, compassion, and love.

For those of you who are black and are tempted to fill with hatred and mistrust of the injustice of such an act, against all white people, I would only say that I can also feel in my own heart the same kind of feeling. I had a member of my family killed, but he was killed by a white man.

But we have to make an effort in the United States. We have to make an effort to understand, to get beyond, or go beyond these rather difficult times.

My favorite poet was Aeschylus. And he once wrote:

Even in our sleep, pain which cannot forget falls drop by drop upon the heart, until, in our own despair, against our will, comes wisdom through the awful grace of God.

What we need in the United States is not division; what we need in the United States is not hatred; what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but is love, and wisdom, and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black.

So I ask you tonight to return home, to say a prayer for the family of Martin Luther King yeah, it's true but more importantly to say a prayer for our own country, which all of us love a prayer for understanding and that compassion of which I spoke.

We can do well in this country. We will have difficult times. We've had difficult times in the past, but we and we will have difficult times in the future. It is not the end of violence; it is not the end of lawlessness; and it's not the end of disorder.

But the vast majority of white people and the vast majority of black people in this country want to live together, want to improve the quality of our life, and want justice for all human beings that abide in our land.

And let's dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world. Let us dedicate ourselves to that, and say a prayer for our country and for our people.

Thank you very much."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 2018, I was improperly recorded as a Yes vote on Roll Call No. 11. This was in error and that I wish to be recorded as a No on RC No. 11.

SENATE BILL 139

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 19, 2018

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) provides a framework for the Government to target non-U.S. persons located overseas to obtain foreign intelligence information, with the compelled assistance of electronic

communication service providers. S. 139 reauthorizes and improves upon this authority—the intelligence value of which cannot be overstated. For example, Section 702 was critical in the tracking of Hajji Iman, a senior Islamic State terrorist who was removed from the battlefield.

Members have had numerous opportunities over the past several years to attend Section 702 education sessions, either on Capitol Hill or at Fort Meade, Maryland. These sessions have demonstrated the extensive level of oversight related to this authority, and underscored that no acts of intentional abuse have occurred since its creation. Despite these facts, and the fact that various courts have affirmed the constitutionality of Section 702, some Members sought to add further protections to enhance U.S. person privacy. As a result, S. 139, which reauthorizes title VII of FISA for six years, includes additional privacy, oversight and transparency provisions.

Throughout the debate, a good deal of inaccurate information about Section 702—including about the program's oversight, as well as the current or potential use of incidentally collected U.S. persons information by the Government—was put forward publicly.

Section 702 is not a bulk-collection authority. It is instead narrowly applied to a relatively small number of targets worldwide. In the Director of National Intelligence's 2016 annual transparency report, the Intelligence Community publicly reported that there are roughly 106,000 Section 702 targets—a vanishingly small fraction of the worldwide population of just over 7 billion. The targets' communications are, moreover, sought only for legally authorized foreign intelligence purposes. Section 702 is used for counterterrorism purposes, as well as to target spies, weapons proliferators, and other foreign threats to the United States and allies.

Section 702 is subject to a rigorous oversight regime by all three branches of government. The independent Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) produced a report on Section 702 in 2014, which states that Section 702 is constitutionally sound and implemented in a way that protects U.S. person privacy, while at the same time offering several recommendations to better enhance the program's privacy protections. As of 2016, the PCLOB reported that the Executive Branch has implemented all of its recommendations, either in whole or in part. In addition, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), as well as several U.S. district courts and the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, have confirmed that Section 702 is constitutional, and that the implementation of the program is consistent with the Fourth Amendment.

1. NSA'S "ABOUT" COMMUNICATION COLLECTION

One issue during the reauthorization debate was how, if at all, Congress might address the National Security Agency (NSA's) voluntarily discontinued practice of collecting so-called "about" communications, in connection with NSA's Section 702 upstream collection. NSA and other Intelligence Community agencies obtain so-called "downstream" collection, which involves only the collection of messages "to" or "from" Section 702 selectors. NSA, on the other hand, is the only Intelligence Community element that conducts Section 702 upstream collection, which permits NSA to target non-U.S. people located outside of the United

States for foreign intelligence purposes with the assistance of the providers that operate the "Internet backbone."

Because of the way communications traverse the Internet, it is possible for NSA to acquire communications "about" a Section 702 target's specific selector, rather than "to" or "from" the selector. This type of communication is known as an "about" communication, and takes place only in NSA's upstream collection. NSA is statutorily prohibited from intentionally acquiring domestic communications, meaning those that originate and end in the United States. Therefore, NSA set up several filters in upstream collection to avoid intentionally ingesting domestic communications.

In 2016, NSA self-reported a technical problem related to "about" communication collection. The agency then informed the Department of Justice, the FISC, and the appropriate congressional committees. The FISC raised concerns with the compliance incident, and ordered NSA to find a solution. After much consideration, NSA, on its own initiative, decided to cease "about" communication collection to fix the issues discussed with the FISC. This type of self-reporting of compliance incidents is expected of the Intelligence Community elements—and is reason to credit, rather than doubt, Section 702 oversight mechanisms. This incident and resulting chain of events demonstrates that the law is working as intended and does not indicate that abuse has occurred or that Congress needs to further limit the Section 702 authority.

Some in Congress called for a permanent end to "about" communication collection. Such a prohibition would limit NSA's ability to reconstitute the collection in the future, even with FISC approval, and use it to identify threat networks. For that reason, rather than permanently prohibiting NSA's "about" communication collection, S. 139 includes a compromise that allows for the possibility of a future technical solution. If NSA wants to restart "about" communication collection, NSA would need to first convince the FISC that the technical changes to "about" communication collection satisfy the FISC's concerns from 2016. After receiving FISC approval to restart "about" communication collection, NSA would brief the relevant congressional committees of jurisdiction, and then wait 30 days to provide Congress time to act. If Congress takes no action in 30 days, NSA may move forward with "about" communication collection. This legislation strikes the right balance between national security and privacy.

2. FBI ACCESS TO SECTION 702 INFORMATION FOR CRIMINAL PURPOSES

Similar to all other surveillance authorities, it is possible that a Section 702 target may communicate with a U.S. person or person located inside the United States. Collection on a U.S. person communicating with a foreign target is known as "incidental collection." Such "incidental collection" is carefully managed. The Intelligence Community's procedures for handling the incidental collection of U.S. person information are regularly reviewed by the FISC, and have been found to be sufficient by the PCLOB. Furthermore, U.S. district courts have reviewed the issue of incidental collection of U.S. person information under Section 702, and determined that such collection is consistent with the Fourth Amendment.

Despite the number of Section 702 education sessions sponsored by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (the

Committee), some have claimed that the Intelligence Community is abusing the Section 702 authority by targeting Americans, an action that is specifically prohibited by statute. There is, however, no evidence of a single intentional abuse that has resulted in the improper targeting of Americans. There have been others who have asserted that the Intelligence Community has inaccurately reported certain statistics each year related to the use of Section 702. These claims are demonstrably false, and unsupported by any evidence. Unfortunately, the dissemination of such inaccurate information is a disservice to the American public and the men and women of the Intelligence Community who serve in silence to keep us all safe from threats, both foreign and domestic.

During the course of reauthorization discussions over the past several months, the Committee has brokered key compromises necessary to reauthorize this critical national security authority. Therefore, after significant de-

liberation, the House and Senate leadership agreed to institute a probable cause-based order requirement for the FBI to access the content of a Section 702 communication that is responsive to a U.S. person query conducted by the FBI during a criminal investigation not related to the national security of the United States. This order requirement does not mandate that the FBI obtain an order before reviewing metadata, accessing the results of any query reasonably designed to return foreign intelligence information, or querying to return evidence of a crime that is related to the national security of the United States. The order requirement is narrowly tailored to address instances where FBI is conducting a predicated investigation into criminal activity not related to national security and seeks to access the content of a Section 702 communication.

Consistent with well-established case law, the order requirement should not be construed to mean—and it is not the Committee's in-

tent—that law enforcement access to lawfully-acquired information constitutes a separate “search” under the Fourth Amendment. The Fourth Amendment, as interpreted by various federal courts, does not require the FBI to obtain an order from the FISC to review lawfully-acquired Section 702 information, even if such access was pursuant to a query using a U.S. person identifier. Accordingly, the agreement to institute this limited order requirement is intended as a legislative accommodation to provide additional statutory protections for U.S. person information that is incidentally collected under Section 702.

This order requirement, along with the restrictions on the use of Section 702 information in criminal prosecutions, should provide further assurances to the American public that the purpose of this critical national security tool is to discover and mitigate foreign threats to the United States, and the handling and use of Section 702 information against U.S. persons is carefully controlled and managed.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S315–S357

Measures Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2325–2328. **Pages S347–48**

House Messages:

Further Continuing Appropriations Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 195, to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the distribution of free printed copies of the Federal Register to Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the United States, taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S316–44, S351–55**

Rejected:

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1905, to change the enactment date. (By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 15), Senate tabled the motion.) **Page S354**

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1903 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date. (Senate tabled the motion.) **Page S316**

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Page S316**

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1917 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill), of a perfecting nature. **Page S354**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1918, to change the enactment date. **Page S354**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1917 (to the

House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill) (listed above), and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Monday, January 22, 2018. **Page S354**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 14), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Pages S351–52**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Page S352**

McConnell Amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1905), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1905 (listed above) was tabled. **Page S316**

McConnell Amendment No. 1907 (to Amendment No. 1906), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 1906 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 1905) (listed above) fell. **Page S316**

McConnell Amendment No. 1904 (to Amendment No. 1903), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1903 (to the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment to the bill) (listed above) was tabled. **Page S316**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the House message to accompany the bill at approximately 12 noon, on Saturday, January 20, 2018. **Page S355**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Edward Charles Prado, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Argentine Republic.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, and Navy.

Pages S355–57

Messages from the House: **Page S346**

Measures Referred: **Page S346**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S346**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S346–47**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S348**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
Pages S348–49

Additional Statements: **Pages S345–46**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S349–51**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today.
(Total—15) **Pages S352, S365**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11 a.m. on Friday, January 19, 2018 and adjourned at 1:28 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2018, until 12 noon on the same day. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S355.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security: Senators Blunt (Chair), Wicker, Cruz, Fischer,

Moran, Sullivan, Heller, Inhofe, Lee, Capito, Gardner, Young, Cantwell, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Schatz, Markey, Udall, Peters, Baldwin, Duckworth, Hassan, and Tester.

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet: Senators Wicker (Chair), Blunt, Cruz, Fischer, Moran, Sullivan, Heller, Inhofe, Lee, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Young, Schatz, Cantwell, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Markey, Udall, Peters, Baldwin, Duckworth, Hassan, Cortez Masto, and Tester.

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security: Senators Moran (Chair), Blunt, Cruz, Fischer, Heller, Inhofe, Lee, Capito, Young, Blumenthal, Klobuchar, Markey, Udall, Duckworth, Hassan, and Cortez Masto.

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard: Senators Sullivan (Chair), Wicker, Fischer, Inhofe, Lee, Johnson, Gardner, Young, Baldwin, Cantwell, Blumenthal, Schatz, Markey, and Peters.

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness: Senators Cruz (Chair), Moran, Sullivan, Lee, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Markey, Schatz, Udall, Peters, Baldwin, and Hassan.

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security: Senators Fischer (Chair), Wicker, Blunt, Heller, Inhofe, Johnson, Capito, Gardner, Young, Peters, Cantwell, Klobuchar, Blumenthal, Udall, Baldwin, Duckworth, and Hassan.

Senators Thune and Nelson are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 37 public bills, H.R. 4844–4870; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 126–127; H. Con. Res. 99; and H. Res. 705–707, were introduced. **Pages H581–82**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H583–84**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Mara Nathan, Temple Beth-El, San Antonio, Texas. **Page H557**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H557, H572**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Al Green (TX) announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H559–60**

Question of Privilege: Representative Al Green (TX) rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a privileged resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the McCarthy motion to table H. Res. 705, impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors, by a yea-and-nay vote of 355 yeas to 66 nays with three answering "present", Roll No. 35. **Pages H569–71**

Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act: The House passed H.R. 4712, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 36. **Pages H560–69, H571**

H. Res. 694, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4712) was agreed to yesterday, January 18th.

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Hoyer motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 1 aye to 418 noes with one answering “present”, Roll No. 37. **Pages H571–72**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:10 p.m. and reconvened at 1:01 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2018. **Page H581**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H570, H571, and H571–72. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:02 a.m. on Saturday, January 20, 2018.

Committee Meetings

SAFETY OF THE U.S. FOOD SUPPLY: CONTINUING CONCERNS OVER THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION'S FOOD- RECALL PROCESS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Safety of the U.S. Food Supply: Continuing Concerns Over the Food and Drug Administration's Food-Recall Process”. Testimony was heard from Gloria Jarmon, Deputy Inspector General of Audit Services, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services; and Douglas Stearn, Director, Office of Enforcement and Import Operations, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Food and Drug Administration.

LEGISLATION ADDRESSING LNG EXPORTS AND PURPA MODERNIZATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Legislation Addressing LNG Exports and PURPA Modernization”. Testimony was heard from Steven Winberg, Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy; James Danly, General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; Travis Kavulla, Vice Chairman, Montana Public Service Commission; and public witnesses.

DEFICIENCIES IN THE PERMITTING PROCESS FOR OFFSHORE SEISMIC RESEARCH

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Deficiencies in the Permitting Process for Offshore Seismic Research”. Testimony was heard from Walter Cruickshank, Acting Director, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; Tom Davis, Senator, District 46, South Carolina; Jon Ludwigson, Acting Director, Government Accountability Office, Denver, Colorado; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, JANUARY 20, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD Week of January 22 through January 26, 2018

Senate Chamber

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Armed Services: January 23, to receive a closed briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review, 9:30 a.m., SVC–217.

January 23, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, to hold closed hearings to examine cyber warfighting policy, 3:30 p.m., SVC–217.

January 24, Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to receive a closed briefing on global nuclear developments, 2:30 p.m., SVC–217.

January 24, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine officer personnel management and the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980, 3 p.m., SR–222.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine global challenges and United States national security strategy, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: January 23, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors, and to be a Member of the Board of

Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Marvin Goodfriend, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Thomas E. Workman, of New York, to be a Member of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, 10 a.m., SD-538.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States reform, focusing on Administration perspectives on the essential elements, 10 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on the Budget: January 24, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Congressional Budget Office, 10:30 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: January 23, Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security, to hold hearings to examine surface transportation security, focusing on addressing current and emerging threats, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Wireless Emergency Alert system, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: January 23, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the performance of the electric power system in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic during recent winter weather events, including the bomb cyclone, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: January 23, to hold hearings to examine facing 21st century public health threats, focusing on our Nation's preparedness and response capabilities, 10 a.m., SD-430.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on access and innovation, 10 a.m., SD-430.

January 25, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Frank T. Brogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, 2:30 p.m., SD-430.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: January 25, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold hearings to examine combating the opioid crisis, focusing on exploiting vulnerabilities in international mail, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: January 24, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, and Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: January 23, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

January 25, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

Special Committee on Aging: January 24, to hold hearings to examine turning 65, focusing on navigating critical decisions to age well, 9:30 a.m., SD-562.

House Committees

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Saturday, January 20

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Saturday, January 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Saturday: Senate will continue consideration of the McConnell motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 195, Further Continuing Appropriations Act, with a further amendment.

House Chamber

Program for Saturday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Budd, Ted, N.C., E73
 Carson, André, Ind., E79
 Courtney, Joe, Conn., E77
 Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E73, E78
 Davis, Rodney, Ill., E70
 DeSaulnier, Mark, Calif., E70, E73, E76
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E74, E77
 Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E77
 Donovan, Daniel M., Jr., N.Y., E69
 Faso, John J., N.Y., E70

Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E69
 Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E71
 Gosar, Paul, Ariz., E78
 Hudson, Richard, N.C., E71, E72, E74, E76, E77
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E75
 LaHood, Darin, Ill., E69, E74
 McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E70, E76
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E79
 Moolenaar, John R., Mich., E73
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E71
 Nunes, Devin, Calif., E80

Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E69
 Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E69
 Posey, Bill, Fla., E75
 Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E72
 Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E70, E74, E76, E77, E78
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E78
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E74
 Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E72
 Watson Coleman, Bonnie, N.J., E75
 Welch, Peter, Vt., E79
 Westerman, Bruce, Ark., E71
 Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E80



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.